



University of Kentucky  
**UKnowledge**

---

MPA/MPP Capstone Projects

Martin School of Public Policy and  
Administration

---

2012

## Has the Emergence of Charter Schools Affected Student Performance in Traditional Public Schools in Shared Markets? Recent Evidence from Public Schools in Ohio

Robert Akers  
*University of Kentucky*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://uknowledge.uky.edu/mpampp\\_etds](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/mpampp_etds)



Part of the [Education Policy Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs Commons](#)

**Right click to open a feedback form in a new tab to let us know how this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Akers, Robert, "Has the Emergence of Charter Schools Affected Student Performance in Traditional Public Schools in Shared Markets? Recent Evidence from Public Schools in Ohio" (2012). *MPA/MPP Capstone Projects*. 58.

[https://uknowledge.uky.edu/mpampp\\_etds/58](https://uknowledge.uky.edu/mpampp_etds/58)

This Graduate Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration at UKnowledge. It has been accepted for inclusion in MPA/MPP Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of UKnowledge. For more information, please contact [UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:UKnowledge@lsv.uky.edu).

# HAS THE EMERGENCE OF CHARTER SCHOOLS AFFECTED STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN TRADITIONAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN SHARED MARKETS? RECENT EVIDENCE FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN OHIO

*Robert Akers*

## **Abstract**

This paper addresses a key issue in the charter school debate, which is whether or not the existence of charter schools in a specific locality causes neighboring traditional public schools to improve their effectiveness. Measuring four student outcomes in Ohio counties where charter school enrollment represents at least five percent of the total public school-age population yielded mixed results. Standardized test scores in math and reading failed to keep pace with state averages but progress was made closing the gap in graduation rates and Performance Index Scores (the PIS is a weighted score given by the Ohio Department of Education that is a general measure of student performance). It is notable that charter schools in Ohio have made the greatest inroads into the community in counties that are demographically homogeneous, being poorer, less educated, and less ethnically diverse than other Ohio counties.

## **I. Introduction**

This is a retrospective longitudinal study using a ten-year data panel to examine four indicators of academic achievement in Ohio public school districts located in counties where at least five percent of the student population is enrolled in charter schools. Those school districts are compared to state averages in the areas of 4<sup>th</sup> grade reading and math scores, graduation rates, and a Performance Index Score (a weighted score made available for each district by the Ohio Department of Education) to determine if the presence of charter schools, or community schools as they are known in Ohio, has any effect on nearby traditional public schools.

Forty states and Washington, D.C. have passed charter school legislation, and in the remaining states that have not passed such legislation the debate lingers on. In researching charter school legislation I was granted interviews with Republicans and Democrats who serve in the Kentucky state legislature representing both sides of the issue. Among those who favor charters there were several supportive arguments, but one was put forth consistently: they assert that in a competitive environment traditional public schools will rise to the challenge in order to maintain market share, resulting in enhanced output measures in charter schools and traditional public schools. Relatively little quantitative research is available concerning this point, but it is a topic that deserves attention. There are critical challenges to interpreting the data of such a study and I have attempted to identify several other variables that might also be influencing the metrics.

## ***The Fight Over Charter Schools***

For several decades test scores of public school students in the United States have failed to keep pace with those of other industrialized nations. There is, however, tremendous dissension when it comes to proposals to rectify the situation. While there is much talk about education reform, some see no possibility that meaningful changes can take place within the traditional system. Charter schools, a popular reform introduced in Wisconsin in 1991, allow public funds to be used to educate students in a non-traditional setting. Proponents of charter school legislation claim that traditional public systems are ossified and resistant to change; they place the blame for the debacle of flagging test scores in traditional public schools squarely on the shoulders of school district leadership (which is often selected by a political process that some see as a corrupting influence) and teachers' unions, which are seen as protecting inferior educators and resisting needed reforms. These advocates often point to studies which seem to indicate that charter schools, free from restrictions such as limitations on how much time students can spend in school are realizing improved student achievement.

Opponents of charter schools claim that charter school reforms are actually detrimental to public education because of lost resources and focus, pointing to studies that suggest that charter schools are not delivering significantly improved results. There is also a concern that charter schools are "cream skimming", or catering only to students who are most likely to succeed in a classroom. However, according to a 2007 survey produced by the Center for Education Reform (a pro-charter school group), 54% of charter school students qualified for free or reduced lunches – a measure often used to determine the rate of low-income student

enrollment (and this number is possible skewed downward because many charter schools do not offer the free and reduced lunch program at all).

Some have questioned the motivation of charter school proponents, openly querying if the creation of charters is a scheme to enable “white flight” from ethnically diverse traditional public schools. A Worcester, MA school official remarked “Choice is race” in an interview with researchers (Teske, 2001). A 2012 study by the GAO found that minorities, especially black students, are actually over-represented in charter schools nationwide.

The very existence of charter schools belies the fact that many reformers see the problems vexing the American public education system as a systemic failure that can only be rectified by removing the bureaucratic “red tape” that is believed to create inefficiencies in the education process. While “school choice” (of which is charter school legislation is only a part) has become a topic of rancorous debate in many states, the federal government has taken a leading role in advocating the passage of charter reform. This is a tacit admittance that true reform is too complex to be readily achieved within the context of traditional public schools. The argument has been made that because traditional public schools are unwieldy and resistant to potential improvements out of a sense of complacency; they might be induced to embrace reform by the existence of competing charter schools.

## **II. Problem Statement**

The need for evaluation of the outcomes of traditional public schools in markets where charter schools have made the most extensive in-roads is supported by documentation:

In the two decades since the inception of charter schools Forman (2010), Booker (2004, 2005), and Teske (2000) have all researched the consequences of the establishment of charter schools on near-by traditional public schools.

While supporters of charter school legislation in states like Kentucky that currently do not allow charters (as well as those who advocate reducing the limitations of charter school creation and enrollment in states such as Ohio which already permit them) argue that the presence of charters is good for all students, creating a win-win scenario in which charter schools innovate and traditional public school replicate, not everyone foresees the same conclusion. Charter school opponents argue that the result of expanded legislation will be diminished student performance perhaps because of (a) diminished per-student funding and (b) the loss of experienced educators to more lucrative charter school posts. (CREDO, 2009; NCES, 2006).

The federal Department of Education is playing an active role in the charter school debate by tying funding through the Race to the Top program to charter school implementation. As a result, the debate is not going away soon, and more information is needed to ascertain what, if any, effect charter schools are having on the entire school-age population.

### **Genesis of Charter Schools and Charter School Legislation**

Charter schools originated from the professed frustration of education reformers in the 1980s who believed their best efforts were being stymied by the fixed bureaucratic structure of the American education system and the impossibility of creating the political pressure

necessary for large-scale changes. Charter schools have two significant features: they operate as autonomous public schools and have waivers exempting them from many state education regulations; and they are accountable for student achievement (historically more than 12% of charter schools have lost their charter due to insufficient student progress).

### **Conflicting Reports: Are Charter Schools Succeeding?**

Booker (*"Charter School Performance in Texas"*, 2004) examined the progress five cohorts of charter school students as measured by TAAS scores (controlling for student mobility). The analysis of the data showed that charter school students realized significantly improved math and reading scores dependent on how long they had been enrolled in the charter school. However, a report by the Wall Street Journal claimed that this and other studies are using flawed methodologies which fail to accurately assess whether a charter school is actually outperforming or underperforming its traditional public school rivals (Carl Bialik, *"Studies That Grade Charter Schools Rely on Imperfect Math"*, November, 2010). Because most reports do not attempt to compare subsets of students who are truly comparable in prior achievement their validity is undermined.

The Center for Research on Education Outcomes (CREDO) issued a report in 2009 that is widely quoted by charter school advocates and opponents. While the study did not match charter schools to traditional public schools, a study of charter schools in sixteen states found that 17% of charter school students outperformed traditional public school students in the same state, 37% performed worse, and 46% showed no difference. (Charter school advocates such as Kentucky Sen. Ken Winters have pointed out that the study noted significant

improvement in performance of charter schools that had been in existence for at least three years).


### **III. How States with Significant Charter Schools are Performing Compared to National Averages**

Although 40 states and the District of Columbia have instituted charter schools (and, as noted earlier, annual enrollment continues to increase) it is difficult to assess the connection between charter schools and changes in student performance nation-wide. It will take many more years to fully assess the effects of charter school legislation, in part because charter school students still make up only a tiny fraction of the total student-age population (in fact, as of September 2012, New Orleans Public Schools is the only system in the nation in which a majority of children are educated in charter schools; taking advantage of the opportunity for a fresh start after Hurricane Katrina's devastation New Orleans dramatically embraced the charter model). However, for the sake of this study I believe it would be beneficial to observe how student performance has changed over the last decade in states in which charter school enrollment accounts for at least 5% of the total school-age population (referred to as "target states" for the purpose of this research). (Five percent enrollment will be considered the threshold for significance, and performance from only the last decade will be examined. While charter schools have been in existence since the early 1990s, their rarity prior to 2000 makes any performance assessment prior to the last ten years immaterial to this study. For the purposes of this paper, the term "charter school era" will apply to 2000 to the present).

Although most charter school states continue to maintain restrictions on charter school enrollment and the number of charters granted, each year the charter school market share of



American students continues to grow at a rapid pace. Below are the enrollment figures for charter schools in the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 school years.



**Table 1: Current Enrollment in Charter School States**

Year	Public School-Age Population	Traditional Public Schools	TPS percentage	Charter Schools	CS percentage
2008-09	43,700,121	42,296,029	96.7%	1,404,092	3.2%
2009-10	43,912,311	42,337,326	96.4%	1,524,985	3.5%

Source: GAO report, June 2012


Some states have embraced charter school reform much more vigorously than the national average. For the purpose of this research they will be referred to as the target states. Below is enrollment data regarding charter school enrollment for these states at the beginning of the charter school era as well as figures for the most recent school year available.

**Table 2: Charter School Enrollment in Target States**

<b>1999-2000</b>					
<i>State</i>	<i>Charter Schools</i>			<i>Charter Students</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>As a percentage of all public schools</i>	<i>Percentage distribution</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>As a percentage of all public schools</i>
<b>United States</b>	<b>1,456</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>339,678</b>	<b>0.7</b>
Arizona	220	14.2	15.1	31,176	3.7
California	236	2.8	16.2	104,730	1.8
Colorado	69	4.4	4.7	17,822	2.5
Delaware	1	0.5	0.1	115	0.1
Florida	112	3.6	7.7	17,251	0.7
Idaho	8	1.2	0.5	915	0.4
Michigan	172	4.8	11.8	46,078	2.8
Ohio	48	1.3	3.3	9,809	0.5
Utah	6	0.8	0.4	390	0.1

<b>2009-2010</b>					
<i>State</i>	<i>Charter Schools</i>			<i>Charter School Students</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>As a percentage of all public schools</i>	<i>Percentage distribution</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>As a percentage of all public schools</i>
<b>United States</b>	<b>4,891</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1,611,332</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Arizona	499	23.9	10.2	113,974	10.6
California	796	8.1	16.3	317,363	5.1
Colorado	158	8.8	3.2	66,826	8.0
Delaware	18	8.8	0.4	9,173	7.3
Florida	410	10.8	8.4	137,887	5.2
Idaho	36	5.0	0.7	14,529	5.3
Michigan	288	7.8	5.9	110,845	6.9
Ohio	321	8.6	6.6	90,989	5.2
Utah	72	7.3	1.5	33,968	5.8

Charter school penetration by state is illustrated in the map below:



Comparing state education performance has always been problematic (see the section below entitled “Measuring Achievement in Schools and Barriers to Doing So”), but as a result of the No Child Left Behind legislation, new test scores are available that shed light on student success. These National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores, the only periodic measure of student achievement based on national probability samples, provide valid comparisons of academic progress between states (*NAEP Validity Studies Panel*). Additionally I believe it is beneficial to survey graduation and dropout rates, as they are important indicators of student accomplishment.


I think it is very significant that the target states lagged behind national averages in every one of these indicators at the dawn of the charter school era; this is replicated in the data

analysis for Ohio public schools in the research later in this paper and could contribute to explaining why charter schools have become so popular in some states more than others.

### **Student Performance in Charter States**

- **Freshman Graduation Rates**

This is the proportion of students who graduate from high school four years after enrolling as ninth graders. During the charter school era the national graduation rate has risen 2.9% but target state graduation rates have risen only .7%.



The National Center for Education Statistics provides forecasts of graduation rates broken down by region. The table below demonstrates that most of the target states are not projected to keep pace with the national average or even with other states in their region.

**Table 3. Actual and projected percentage changes in public high school graduates, by region and state:  
Selected school years, 2002–03 through 2020–21 (NCES)**

Region and state	Actual 2002–03 to 2007–08	Projected		
		2007–08 to 2014–15	2014–15 to 2020–21	2007–08 to 2020–21
<b>United States</b>	<b>10.3</b>	<b>-4.4</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>-0.6</b>
<b>Midwest</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>-7.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>-6.5</b>
Michigan	14.8	-15.3	-7.7	-21.8
Ohio	4.3	-9.4	-0.5	-9.8
<b>South</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>-0.3</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>6.9</b>
Delaware	8.4	5.7	12.3	18.7
District of Columbia	23.0	-28.4	-9.2	-35.0
Florida	16.9	-10.6	-4.1	-14.2
<b>West</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>-1.7</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>3.9</b>
Arizona	23.4	-1.2	13.1	11.8
California	9.8	-3.5	0.7	-2.8
Colorado	8.7	6.1	16.1	23.2
Utah	-4.6	3.2	22.3	26.2

NOTE: Calculations are based on unrounded numbers. Mean absolute percentage errors of public high school graduates by state and region can be found in table A-10, appendix A.


- **Dropout Rates**

During the charter school era dropout rates have risen .2% nationally and .3% in target states.

**Table 4: State Dropout Rates: 2003-2009**

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
<b>National Average: Reporting States</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>4.1</b>
Arizona	8.5	6.7	6.2	7.6	7.6	6.7	8.3
California	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.7	5.5	5.0	5.0
Colorado	3.5	5.4	7.8	7.8	6.9	6.4	6.1
Delaware	5.5	6.1	5.3	5.5	5.5	6.0	5.1
District of Colombia	*	*	*	*	7.1	5.5	7.0
Florida	3.4	3.4	3.5	4.1	3.8	3.3	2.6
Idaho	3.9	3.1	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.0	1.6
Michigan	4.5	4.6	3.9	3.5	7.4	6.2	3.8
Ohio	3.0	3.3	3.5	4.1	4.5	4.3	4.2
Utah	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.3	3.1	4.2	3.3
<b>Average of Target States</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>4.7</b>

\*Information was not reported or did not meet the reporting standards of the US Department of Education. Missing data was not included in averages for this table. SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary/Secondary Education," 2003–04 and 2008–09; and State Public High School Graduates Model, 1980–81 through 2007–08. (This table was prepared January 2011.)




- **NAEP Fourth Grade Reading Scores (2002-2011)**

Scores in target states continue to lag behind national averages, but have made very significant gains to close the gap. While the national average has risen 2 points, the target state average is up 8.

**Table 5: NAEP Reading, Grade 4**

Year	National Average	Target State Average
2002	219	214
2003	218	215
2005	219	216
2007	221	218
2009	221	218
2011	221	218




- **NAEP Fourth Grade Mathematics Scores (2000-2011)**

Again, scores in target states fail to meet national averages both at the beginning and the end of the study period. However, improvements in target states continue to outpace gains made nationally, narrowing the achievement variance.

The national average rose by 15 points while the target state average rose by 19.

**Table 6: NAEP Mathematics, Grade 4**


Year	National Average	Target State Average
2000	226	219
2003	235	231
2005	238	235
2007	240	236
2009	240	237
2011	241	238



- **NAEP Eighth Grade Reading (2002-2011)**

Gains in reading scores by eight graders were minimal (an improvement of 1 point nationally and 2 points in target states), the trend continues as target states have consistently reduced the disparity.





**Table 7: NAEP Reading, Grade 8**


Year	National Average	Target State Average
2002	264	260
2003	263	259
2005	262	258
2007	263	259
2009	264	261
2011	265	262

- **NAEP Eighth Grade Mathematics (2000-2011)**

The scores for eighth grade mathematics do not break the trend of previous NAEP scores. While national scores have risen at an average rate of 11 points, those of target states have risen 13 points.

**Table 8: NAEP Mathematics, Grade 8**

Year	National Average	Target State Average
2000	273	267
2003	278	273
2005	279	274
2007	281	277
2009	283	279
2011	284	280



*Note: The NAEP data panel continues to expand. These are the only scores available consistently throughout the charter school era but more research would be beneficial as data for other indicators become available.*

#### **IV. Research Question**

How are students in traditional public schools faring in a competitive educational environment?

#### **Left Behind: What Variables Other Than Charter Schools Are Affecting Student Achievement?**

By no means has charter school reform been the only issue affecting American schools over the last quarter of a century. From the advent of the internet and technology-enriched

education to the implementation of block scheduling, the American classroom is much changed since the architects of charter school legislation began their crusade. Recognizing that U.S. students were falling behind their counterparts in other developed nations and spurred on by the Clinton administration, the U.S. Department of Education began advocating outcome-based education in the 1990s, promoting standards-based evaluations meant to unify national education methodology. Congress passed groundbreaking legislation entitled National Education Goals (referred to as Goals 2000) that solidified the concept of national education expectations and the role that the federal government would play in education reform. The drive for outcome-based education culminated with the passage of the Bush administration's *No Child Left Behind* Act in 2001.

To improve student performance some states have made various reforms intended to improve teacher effectiveness. Standards for teacher certification have risen and investments have been made in teacher training. While the nation's largest teachers' unions have widely been successful in their opposition to merit pay and the abolition of tenure, a number of states have tied funding at the school level to student test scores and have implemented harsh penalties for schools whose students fail to reach proficiency.

Another reform that originated in Washington during the 1990s that continues to affect American schools was the passage of amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) that increased the responsibility school districts for students even with severe and profound disabilities. In addition to providing what some have described as an unfunded mandate, the most significant result of IDEA has been the implementation of "mainstreaming",

the practice of including disabled students in the regular classroom as much as possible. Although some modifications are permitted (such as easing of time limitations and “scribing” – allowing an adult to write the students’ answers) these students’ scores are included in test results, skewing averages downward.

Also, the last twenty-five years have seen dramatic demographic shifts in the U.S. population. Many states were ill-prepared to meet the needs of students whose first language is not English, and in some states the English-only vs. bilingual education debate continues. Meeting this new challenge has been expensive for schools and has tested traditional pedagogical practices. Students who are not familiar with English struggle to overcome the language barrier in order to learn the curriculum and their test scores, included in school averages without bias, reflect that fact.

Other issues are affecting American schools as well. Some states have passed legislation meant to increase school choice, allowing families to remove their children from failing schools and move them to schools in other neighborhoods. A few states have implemented voucher programs which allow families to use state funds to pay for non-public education. Also homeschooling is on the rise; one study estimated that by 2007 as many as 1.5 million students were being home schooled – and increase of 74% since 1999.

### **The State of Ohio Public Schools**

The “Ohio Charter School Performance Report for 2010-2011” examined Performance Index Scores for Ohio school districts versus expected scores based on statewide trends. The study, which was prepared by Public Impact, found:

- no correlation between the student performance and the variety of charter school authorizer types that exist in the state.
- charter schools in Cleveland and Columbus, the state's largest urban districts, outperformed traditional public schools in every subject.
- charter schools are over-represented at both the highest and lowest ends of Performance Index Score scale.
- it is unclear whether charter schools or traditional public schools are performing better.

It should be noted that charter schools are by no means the only popular choice reform in Ohio. In addition to the brick-and-mortar charter schools, virtual schools have also been granted charters. Virtual schools are completely online and are a popular choice for families who desire to home-school their children while maintaining the benefits of an accredited education. Ohio is also one of the most supportive states for non-public schools, offering bus service even to students of parochial schools.

### **Measuring Achievement in Schools, and Barriers to Doing So**

In order to understand why it has historically been so difficult to create valid comparisons of educational achievement by the states it is necessary to understand the complex tale of the history of public education in the United States. A general review of education policy since the colonial era reveals the changing values and mores of American society and does more than a little to explain the lack of homogeneity in modern pedagogy and assessment. While the national trend for many years has been toward national standards and

federal leadership, there are several reasons why it took more than a century for this philosophy to develop.

From the beginning, education was considered a family, or at most, local concern. The first public school legislation, the “Old Deluder Act”, introduced Massachusetts in 1647 (an era in which about 95% of citizens were farmers) required communities to hire teachers and build school buildings primarily for religious instruction. Wealthier city-dwelling citizens provided tutors for their children for an education that was gender-specific and meant to provide males with the tools they would need to manage business concerns and engage in trade. It would be generations before education was considered to be the purview of governments and worth the expenditure of tax-payer dollars.

Strict constructionists have correctly pointed out that, because the topic of education is not mentioned in the constitution, it is a state issue according to the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment (the “Reserve Clause”). Until recently some presidential candidates have even pledged to abolish the US Department of Education, declaring it to be quasi-constitutional at best. However, beginning with the mid-twentieth century Civil Rights Movement, the courts have consistently recognized the role of the federal government in educational issues, granting more than the enumerated functional powers of the Constitution.

The modern concept of public school education was born of the Progressive Movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Reformers such as Dewey and Piaget advocated education as a means of social reform. Stoddard (2009) explores how changing social values in the late nineteenth century gave rise to the modern public education system.

Today education has become one of the most significant areas of public discussion, seen not only as a social tool but also more relevant than ever in the technologically reliant economy. It appears evident that the future of the American education system will possess a more unified and homogenous pedagogy and assessment. The barriers to measuring state progress are disappearing rapidly.

### **Literature Review**

Booker (*"The Effect of Charter Schools on Traditional Public School Students in Texas: Are Children Who Stay Behind Left Behind?"* 2005) is the single best study I found on measuring the true consequences of charter school competition. The study assess the degree to which a local traditional public school is experiencing the competitive effect of a nearby charter school by examining the number of students *leaving* the traditional public school (as opposed to assuming that charter school enrollment is directly related to exodus from traditional public schools, as most studies do; the data make it evident that many charter school students are coming from other backgrounds such as private schools). The study examined an eight year data set (1995-2002) of Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) scaled TLI scores. Researchers were able to access individual student data and follow the students year by year. Booker found positive and significant relationships between the degree of charter school penetration and student outcomes in traditional public schools in math and reading on both the district and campus levels. The study also revealed that districts with the greatest charter school penetration actually had expenditure growth that was slower than the state average – meaning that scores went up even as funding was diminished. It would be beneficial to see this study replicated in other states to verify the findings.

Hoxby (*“Achievement in Charter Schools and Regular Public Schools in the United States: Understanding the Differences”* 2000) attempts to measure the value of charter schools by comparing the results of test scores in matched pairs of public and charter schools. Each charter school was matched to its geographically closest public school counterpart in order to alleviate the variables of ethnicity, socio-economic status, or other challenges to validity. By testing schools in pairs and accumulating data from many communities Hoxby was able to identify conflicting instances in which the charter school outpaced the traditional public school and other instances where the opposite was true.

Teske (*“Does Charter School Competition Improve Traditional Public Schools?”* 2004) studied the effect of charter school penetration on traditional public schools in urban districts in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C. They found that charter competition “has not induced large changes in district-wide operations, despite the fact that a significant number of students have left district schools for charter schools.” These findings were based on interviews with district superintendents, school board leaders, charter school heads, teachers’ union leaders, and parents. Principals were surveyed by mail (but had a low response rate). The study found that traditional public schools have not responded dramatically to pressure from charter school penetration because:

- reforms in the traditional public school systems have been piecemeal rather than centrally coordinated. Of course, if coordinated reform were possible charter schools would not be necessary.



- hostility between leadership of traditional public schools and charter schools has limited the spillover effect.
- leaders within the traditional public school systems dismiss charter school innovations as inefficient or too specific to be replicated on the larger traditional public school scale.

Teske and his research partners further found that individual schools have been held harmless as funding has been replaced and as, perhaps, population trends have blunted the effect of losing so many students to charter schools. The study is methodologically weak, relying too heavily on surveys and providing very few other reliable measures. An actual examination of budgets and outputs would have made this study more thorough.

Betts and Tang conducted one of the most comprehensive studies of charter school performance in “The Effect of Charter Schools on Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature (2011).” The authors found “compelling evidence that charters under-perform traditional public schools in some locations, grades, and subjects, and out-perform traditional public schools in other locations, grades, and subjects.” The study examined both experimental (lottery) and student-level studies and examined student performance in math and reading. Of the four questions Betts and Tang address, two are especially relevant to this study. First, they conducted a meta-analysis of charter school performance studies to see if the net effect of charter school enrollment is zero; they also counted the critical studies to identify how many demonstrate a correlation between charter school attendance and improved performance versus those that showed the opposite. The authors found no consistent correlation in either measure. The authors failed to control for methodologically tainted studies, giving each piece of

research equal consideration. Since many of the studies fail to make valid comparisons of subsets of students, they are of limited value and should not be relied upon so heavily.

Here is a brief summary of other related research. A 2006 NCES study which provided demographic controls found that charter school students nationwide scored lower than students in traditional public schools in NAEP tests. However, because of the lack of context it is impossible to establish whether charter school students would have done better had they remained in the traditional setting. A CREDO report “Charter School Performance in Indiana” (2011) found positive and significant differences in math and reading scores for charter school students matched to students from traditional public schools.


A 2009 article in the Wall Street Journal (“No Child Left Behind: New Evidence that Charter Schools Help Even Kids in Other Schools”) referenced research by Marcus Winters of the Manhattan Institute in declaring that “competition works.” Winters found that charter competition reduces the black-white achievement gap and that “the worst-performing public school students, who tend to be low-income minorities, have the most to gain from the nearby presence of a charter school.

## **V. Methodology**

In order to identify the populations most impacted by charter schools, I first compiled a list of all charter schools in the state of Ohio and their attendance figures. Virtual charter schools were not included because they represent a small number of charter school enrollment and students are non-localized, making it difficult to estimate their impact. Using the school addresses, I identified the counties in which these charter schools are located and then

compiled a list of traditional public school districts located in those districts. After ascertaining the total enrollment of students in traditional public schools and charter schools by county, I identified the counties in which charter school students represented at least five percent of the entire public school-age population. These counties are identified in Table 9 and the map below.

<b>Table 9: OH Counties with Significant Charter School Enrollment</b>			
<i>County</i>	<i>Charter School Population</i>	<i>Total Enrollment of All Districts in County</i>	<i>Percentage of Students Enrolled in Charter Schools</i>
Allen	662	6,522	10.15%
Butler	926	17,009	5.44%
Clark	745	8,500	8.26%
Madison	243	2,188	11.11%
Marion	254	3,492	7.27%
Richland	622	7,042	8.83%
Scioto	502	4,564	11.00%
Seneca	166	2,540	6.54%
Tascarawas	450	5,569	8.08%
Warren	775	10,072	7.69%



There are notable demographic features of these counties that may explain why charter school enrollment is greater there than others. Eight of the ten counties consistently share notable characteristics which may have an impact on student achievement and could hint at an explanation as to why charters have been so popular there. An examination of data from the 2010 census demonstrates that these counties are less ethnically diverse, less educated, and poorer than state averages.

- *Racial composition of the target counties:*

- White non-Hispanic responders comprised 90.3% of the population versus 83.6% of the state population
- Black responders comprised 6.1% of the population versus 12.4% statewide
- Responders who described themselves as Hispanic comprised 2.5% of the target county population versus 3.3% statewide.
- Responders who were foreign-born comprised 2.8% of the target county population versus 3.8% state-wide
- Households where a language other than English is primarily spoken account for 4.05% of target county responders versus 6.3% for all of Ohio.
- *Economic indicators in target counties\*:*
  - Per capita income is \$22,622.80 versus \$25,113 state-wide
  - Medium Household income is \$46,500.90 versus \$47,358 state-wide
  - Percentage of individuals living below the poverty level is 13.8% in the target counties versus 14.2% state-wide
  - Percentage of population change from 2010-2011 (often an indicator of the economic well-being of a community) was -.14% for target counties versus .1% statewide.
- *Education indicators in target counties\*:*
  - The high school graduation rate in the target counties is 85.5% versus 87.4% statewide.
  - The percentage of the adult population holding at least a bachelors degree is 17.9% versus 24.1% statewide

*\*It is worth noting that two of the target counties, Butler and Warren, are consistent outliers within the target counties, being significantly more populous, better educated, and earning higher incomes than state averages (but sharing ethnic demographics with the remaining target counties). These two counties significantly skew the education and economic indicators of the target counties toward the state averages.*

After identifying the test counties, which will be referred to as target counties in this paper, I then researched the data available from the Ohio Department of Education which had been consistently collected during the charter school era. I chose indicators that provided valid measures of student success to make comparisons between the target counties and state averages.

### **Limitations to the Methodology**

When scrutinizing the measures of student achievement one must keep in mind the serious limitations involved, many of which cannot be overcome because of student privacy issues. This particular research design has a distinctive limitation which must be considered. Although the majority of charter schools and charter school students are located in urban counties, it is in suburban communities and rural counties in which charter schools are likely to represent a significant portion of the student population. This observation should be kept in mind, as it is impossible to anticipate what the effect of larger charter school populations in urban communities would have on traditional public schools located there.

Other limitations have to do with the difficulty in accumulating assessment results that accurately portray what is taking place in the lives of individual students over time. In March, 2012 the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News published a study which suggested that erratic test scores in hundreds of Ohio schools could be the hallmark of systematic cheating on standardized tests in both traditional public schools and charter schools. Recent notorious cheating scandals in other

school systems have brought attention to the unintended consequences of standards-based assessment and cast a shadow on the validity of standardized testing as a measure of student success. Until more data are available it is necessary to keep in mind that test scores could possibly be skewed in a positive direction by dishonest practices. The Ohio Education Association, a large teachers union, responded to the assertions of the study by defending the ethics of school teachers and administrations across the state and referencing the extensive training educators undergo to reinforce the importance of valid assessments.

Additionally, the OEA raised the question of student mobility. Citing the fact that thirty-one percent of students in Cleveland attended more than one school during the 2010 - 2011 school year, the OEA contended that student mobility is more common in poorer urban schools than in wealthier suburban districts (which could ostensibly explain the dramatic changes in test scores from year to year). However, Jaxk Reeves of the University of Georgia's Statistical Consulting Center, a contributor to the study referenced by the Dayton Daily News, denied the idea that student mobility has a significant effect on test scores, maintaining that, unless school districts are redesigned in such a way to affect the socio-economic demographics, "the average students coming and going in a district are going to look pretty much the same." A macro-analysis of the data, then, might or might not be affected by changes in student population.

## **The Data**


To assess student performance in the target counties I gathered an eight-year panel of data that includes standardized testing results for fourth-grade students in mathematics and reading (the Ohio Department of Education now disseminates standardized test results for all

students in a many subjects; for the purpose of this paper I limited the data to only those measures that are available for each of the last ten years. Other data are available in Appendix B). Also included in the data set are freshmen graduation rates and the scaled Performance Index Score that is based on student achievement and is assigned by the ODE to each school district.

## **Key Findings**

- **Fourth grade reading scores:**


Students in the target counties began the charter school era underperforming compared to state averages and, while making significant gains, failed to keep pace with state averages and fell further behind.



- **Fourth grade mathematics scores:**




Like the test scores for reading, students in the target counties began the era with scores that did not meet the state average and, again, failed to keep pace with the rate of gains made across the state. It should be noted that the statewide improvements in reading and mathematics scores are notably positive, but it is not possible to attribute those improvements to the existence of charter schools.



• **Graduation rates:**

Students in target county schools tended to be less likely to graduate high school than their cohort at the beginning of the charter school era (based on percentage of graduates who were enrolled as ninth graders) but have made up some of that difference. While students in target counties are still graduating at a rate that fails to meet the state average, the gap has closed to about 1%.

Table 10: Ohio Graduation Rates: 2001-2011		
Year	Target Counties	State Average
2000-01	86.1	87.5
2001-02	90.3	89.4
2002-03	90.1	90.9
2003-04	92.6	92.5
2004-05	94.3	92.4
2005-06	92.1	92.8
2006-07	92.6	93.6
2007-08	93.3	94.2
2008-09	92.7	93.9
2009-10	92.8	94.0
2010-11	93.4	94.4




- **Performance Index Score**

Like graduation rates, schools in target counties have seen improvements in the Performance Index Scores (a good indicator of over-all school accomplishments) at a rate that is greater than the state average. While the Performance Indicator

Score continues to lag behind state averages, the gap has narrowed over the last decade.

<b>Table 11: Ohio Performance Index Score 2001-2011</b>		
<b><i>Year</i></b>	<b><i>Target Counties</i></b>	<b><i>State Average</i></b>
2000-01	81.5	83.0
2001-02	84.9	85.2
2002-03	86.2	86.8
2003-04	89.8	90.2
2004-05	95.7	92.8
2005-06	96.2	96.5
2006-07	94.8	95.6
2007-08	95.0	95.8
2008-09	95.4	96.4
2009-10	96.2	97.1
2010-11	97.3	98.7



## **Recommendations**

It is unmistakable that further study is needed. Because of *No Child Left Behind* legislation, the state of Ohio is making many more assessment measures available, and time will tell more clearly the true effect of charter school penetration.

Further research might also reveal that there are, perhaps, some non-competitive explanations for changes in school performance in areas with significant charter school enrollment. Because charter schools in a specific market tend to tailor their program to meet the need of a specific subset of students (high performing students, at risk students, students with definite aspirations) – there is a corresponding increase in the homogeneity of student body of the traditional public school. Since studies have shown that thus far traditional public schools are not suffering financially and therefore are ostensibly not reducing staff size, the exodus to charter schools might result in smaller classrooms and a lower teacher-student ratio in the traditional public schools. These are theories that deserve further scrutiny.

Although the results have been mixed, I believe charter schools have provided enough evidence of efficiency to merit further investment. In order to overcome some of the objections raised by those who are opposed to charter school legislation, I suggest the following experimental policies:

- allow individual districts to grant their own charters rather than only the state department of education. Reduce the competition and eliminate the isolation between charters and traditional public schools. This way the district will not face the possibility of lost finances. Of course, teachers' unions will have to sign on for this. Even charter

school opponents such as Kentucky state representative Carl Rollins state “Charter schools are where the innovation is at.” Ultimately charter schools and traditional public schools must be able to coexist.

- require a multi-year commitment between the charter school and enrolling students. While charter schools enroll a diverse population, not enough evidence exists to ascertain how many of the academically inept students are returning to traditional public schools (creating an indirect system of “creaming”).

### **Special Thanks**

Thank you to my capstone committee, Drs. Edward Jennings, Eugenia Toma, and Joshua Cowen of the UK Martin School of Public Policy and Administration. Thank you to Dr. Nicolai Petrovsky for providing additional feedback as I drafted my report. Also a very special thanks to Sen. David Williams, Sen. Ken Winters, Rep. Brad Montell, Rep. Carl Rollins, and the office of Rep. Greg Stumbo for allowing me to interview them about charter schools and school reform.

## Appendices

<b>Appendix A: Demographics of Target Ohio Counties</b>	<b>Ohio</b>	<b>USA</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	11,544,951	311,591,917
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	0.1%	0.9%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	6.2%	6.5%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	23.3%	23.7%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	14.3%	13.3%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	83.6%	78.1%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	12.4%	13.1%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.3%	1.2%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	1.7%	5.0%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	1.9%	2.3%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	3.2%	16.7%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	81.0%	63.4%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	85.0%	84.2%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	3.8%	12.7%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	6.3%	20.1%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	87.4%	85.0%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	24.1%	27.9%
Veterans, 2006-2010	936,383	22,652,496
Housing units, 2011	5,133,446	132,312,404
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	69.2%	66.6%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	23.0%	25.9%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$136,400	\$188,400
Households, 2006-2010	4,552,270	114,235,996
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.46	2.59
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$25,113	\$27,334
Median household income 2006-2010	\$47,358	\$51,914
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	14.2%	13.8%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	295,890,890	5,338,306,501
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	135,575,279	4,174,286,516
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	138,816,008	3,917,663,456
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$12,049	\$12,990
Geography QuickFacts	Ohio	USA
Land area in square miles, 2010	40,860.69	3,531,905.43
Persons per square mile, 2010	282.3	87.4
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts		

<b>People QuickFacts</b>	<b>Allen County</b>	<b>Butler County</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	106,094	369,999
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	-0.2%	0.5%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	6.3%	6.7%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	23.7%	24.9%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	15.0%	11.8%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	84.4%	87.5%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	12.1%	7.7%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.2%	0.3%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.7%	2.5%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	2.5%	1.9%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	2.5%	4.1%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	82.4%	84.0%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	84.5%	82.8%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	1.6%	4.9%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	2.8%	6.5%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	87.2%	86.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	15.8%	25.9%
Veterans, 2006-2010	9,234	26,540
Housing units, 2011	44,896	149,076
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	71.2%	70.9%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	17.6%	21.9%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$104,800	\$160,600
Households, 2006-2010	40,719	134,287
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.51	2.6
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$21,713	\$25,892
Median household income 2006-2010	\$43,632	\$54,788
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	16.3%	12.8%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	10,009,041	11,362,034
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	*	7,336,978
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	1,577,528	4,876,153
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$15,039	\$13,616
<b>Geography QuickFacts</b>	<b>Allen County</b>	<b>Butler County</b>
Land area in square miles, 2010	402.5	467.06
Persons per square mile, 2010	264.2	788.2
	Lima, OH Metro Area	Cincinnati-Middletown,
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts		OH-KY-IN Metro Area
<i>*Information not available</i>		

<b>People QuickFacts</b>	<b>Clark County</b>	<b>Madison County</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	137,691	43,401
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	-0.5%	-0.1%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	6.2%	5.7%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	23.4%	22.3%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	16.4%	12.6%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	87.6%	90.9%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	8.9%	6.8%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.3%	0.3%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.7%	0.6%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	2.5%	1.4%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	2.8%	1.5%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	85.2%	89.6%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	85.4%	82.3%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	2.1%	1.7%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	3.5%	4.3%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	84.8%	84.4%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	16.2%	15.6%
Veterans, 2006-2010	15,098	3,751
Housing units, 2011	61,201	15,989
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	70.2%	71.3%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	18.7%	15.2%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$109,900	\$146,800
Households, 2006-2010	55,145	14,745
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.47	2.53
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$22,110	\$23,980
Median household income 2006-2010	\$44,141	\$50,533
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	15.9%	11.7%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	2,494,342	994,608
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	*	*
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	1,398,675	958,649
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$9,977	\$22,988
<b>Geography QuickFacts</b>	<b>Clark County</b>	<b>Madison County</b>
Land area in square miles, 2010	397.47	465.88
Persons per square mile, 2010	348	93.2
	Springfield, OH Metro	Columbus, OH Metro
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts		
<i>*Information not available</i>		



<b>People QuickFacts</b>	<b>Marion County</b>	<b>Richland County</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	66,212	123,510
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	-0.4%	-0.8%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	5.8%	5.9%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	21.8%	22.1%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	14.5%	16.6%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	91.7%	87.9%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	5.9%	9.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.2%	0.2%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.6%	0.7%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	1.6%	1.8%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	2.3%	1.5%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	89.8%	86.6%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	81.3%	84.0%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	1.4%	1.8%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	2.7%	3.9%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	83.0%	84.3%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	12.0%	14.9%
Veterans, 2006-2010	5,762	12,370
Housing units, 2011	27,776	54,459
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	71.4%	71.2%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	16.9%	18.9%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$98,500	\$112,200
Households, 2006-2010	24,863	48,557
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.45	2.45
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$19,849	\$21,459
Median household income 2006-2010	\$40,511	\$42,664
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	17.3%	12.4%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	3,409,213	3,563,738
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	338,058	1,010,587
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	674,758	1,489,514
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$10,301	\$11,818
<b>Geography QuickFacts</b>	<b>Marion County</b>	<b>Richland County</b>
Land area in square miles, 2010	403.76	495.27
Persons per square mile, 2010	164.7	251.3
	Marion, OH Micro	Mansfield, OH Metro Area
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts		

<b>People QuickFacts</b>	<b>Scioto County</b>	<b>Seneca County</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	79,277	56,469
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	-0.3%	-0.5%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	6.0%	6.1%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	22.5%	23.3%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	15.6%	15.0%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	94.6%	95.0%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	2.8%	2.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.6%	0.2%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.4%	0.6%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	1.7%	1.6%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	1.1%	4.4%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	93.6%	91.2%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	85.1%	85.1%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	1.0%	1.4%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	2.1%	3.0%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	81.2%	87.5%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	12.7%	16.1%
Veterans, 2006-2010	6,867	5,027
Housing units, 2011	33,985	24,072
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	69.5%	75.1%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	14.7%	13.1%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$85,000	\$101,100
Households, 2006-2010	30,162	22,138
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.51	2.49
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$17,778	\$20,976
Median household income 2006-2010	\$32,812	\$42,573
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	20.8%	11.9%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	927,058	1,408,813
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	*	*
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	700,731	458,832
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$9,170	\$8,087
<b>Geography QuickFacts</b>	<b>Scioto County</b>	<b>Seneca County</b>
Land area in square miles, 2010	610.21	551.02
Persons per square mile, 2010	130.3	103
	Portsmouth, OH Micro	Tiffin, OH Micro
Source: US Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts		
<i>* Information not available</i>		

<b>People QuickFacts</b>	<b>Tuscarawas County</b>	<b>Warren County</b>
Population, 2011 estimate	92,508	214,910
Population, percent change, April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2011	-0.1%	1.0%
Persons under 5 years, percent, 2011	6.1%	6.5%
Persons under 18 years, percent, 2011	23.4%	27.0%
Persons 65 years and over, percent, 2011	16.6%	11.1%
White persons, percent, 2011 (a)	97.0%	90.8%
Black persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.9%	3.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.4%	0.2%
Asian persons, percent, 2011 (a)	0.4%	4.1%
Persons reporting two or more races, percent, 2011	1.1%	1.4%
Persons of Hispanic or Latino Origin, percent, 2011 (b)	2.0%	2.4%
White persons not Hispanic, percent, 2011	95.5%	88.7%
Living in same house 1 year & over, 2006-2010	89.7%	86.5%
Foreign born persons, percent, 2006-2010	1.1%	4.8%
Language other than English spoken at home, pct age 5+, 2006-2010	5.3%	6.4%
High school graduates, percent of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	84.5%	90.8%
Bachelor's degree or higher, pct of persons age 25+, 2006-2010	14.3%	35.9%
Veterans, 2006-2010	8,523	15,791
Housing units, 2011	40,264	81,843
Homeownership rate, 2006-2010	74.7%	79.9%
Housing units in multi-unit structures, percent, 2006-2010	13.9%	15.3%
Median value of owner-occupied housing units, 2006-2010	\$110,900	\$194,700
Households, 2006-2010	36,128	74,144
Persons per household, 2006-2010	2.53	2.71
Per capita money income in past 12 months (2010 dollars) 2006-2010	\$20,536	\$31,935
Median household income 2006-2010	\$42,081	\$71,274
Persons below poverty level, percent, 2006-2010	12.8%	6.0%
Manufacturers shipments, 2007 (\$1000)	2,206,524	4,111,235
Merchant wholesaler sales, 2007 (\$1000)	251,141	2,006,795
Retail sales, 2007 (\$1000)	1,077,428	1,862,643
Retail sales per capita, 2007	\$11,800	\$9,129
<b>Geography QuickFacts</b>	<b>Tuscarawas County</b>	<b>Warren County</b>
Land area in square miles, 2010	567.64	401.31
Persons per square mile, 2010	163.1	530
	New Philadelphia-Dover,	Cincinnati-Middletown,
<i>Source: US Census Bureau State &amp; County QuickFacts</i>	OH Micro Area	OH-KY-IN Metro Area

## Appendix B: NAEP Tables

### NAEP Mathematics, Grade 4

#### National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

This report was generated using the NAEP Data Explorer. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>

Average scale scores for mathematics, grade 4 by all students [TOTAL], year and jurisdiction: 2011, 2009, 2007, 2005, 2003, 2000, 1996, 1992, and 1990

Year	Jurisdiction	All students	
		Average scale score	Standard error
<b>2011</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	235	(1.1)
	California	234	(1.4)
	Colorado	244	(0.9)
	Delaware	240	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	222	(0.7)
	Florida	240	(0.8)
	Idaho	240	(0.6)
	Michigan	236	(1.1)
	Ohio	244	(0.8)
	Utah	243	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>238</b>	
<b>2009</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	230	(1.1)
	California	232	(1.2)
	Colorado	243	(1.0)
	Delaware	239	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	219	(0.7)
	Florida	242	(1.0)
	Idaho	241	(0.8)
	Michigan	236	(1.0)
	Ohio	244	(1.1)
	Utah	240	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>237</b>	
<b>2007</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	232	(1.0)
	California	230	(0.7)
	Colorado	240	(1.0)

	Delaware	242	(0.4)
	District of Columbia	214	(0.8)
	Florida	242	(0.8)
	Idaho	241	(0.7)
	Michigan	238	(1.3)
	Ohio	245	(1.0)
	Utah	239	(0.9)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>236</b>	
<b>2005</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>(0.1)</b>
	Arizona	230	(1.1)
	California	230	(0.6)
	Colorado	239	(1.1)
	Delaware	240	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	211	(0.8)
	Florida	239	(0.7)
	Idaho	242	(0.7)
	Michigan	238	(1.2)
	Ohio	242	(1.0)
	Utah	239	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>235</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	229	(1.1)
	California	227	(0.9)
	Colorado	235	(1.0)
	Delaware	236	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	205	(0.7)
	Florida	234	(1.1)
	Idaho	235	(0.7)
	Michigan	236	(0.9)
	Ohio	238	(1.0)
	Utah	235	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>231</b>	
<b>2000</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>(0.9)</b>
	Arizona	219	(1.3)
	California	213	(1.6)
	Colorado	—	†
	Delaware	—	†
	District of Columbia	192	(1.1)
	Florida	—	†
	Idaho	224	(1.4)
	Michigan	229	(1.6)
	Ohio	230	(1.5)
	Utah	227	(1.3)

	TS Average	219	
<b>1992<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>(0.7)</b>
	Arizona	215	(1.1)
	California	208	(1.6)
	Colorado	221	(1.0)
	Delaware	218	(0.8)
	District of Columbia	193	(0.5)
	Florida	214	(1.5)
	Idaho	222	(1.0)
	Michigan	220	(1.7)
	Ohio	219	(1.2)
	Utah	224	(1.0)
	TS Average	215	

— Not available.

† Not applicable.

<sup>1</sup> Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

**NOTE:** The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2011 Mathematics Assessments.

## NAEP Mathematics, Grade 8

### National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

This report was generated using the NAEP Data Explorer. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>

Average scale scores for mathematics, grade 8 by all students [TOTAL], year and jurisdiction: 2011, 2009, 2007, 2005, 2003, 2000, 1996, 1992, and 1990

Year	Jurisdiction	All students	
		Average scale score	Standard error
2011	<b>National</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	279	(1.2)
	California	273	(1.2)
	Colorado	292	(1.1)
	Delaware	283	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	260	(0.7)
	Florida	278	(0.8)
	Idaho	287	(0.8)
	Michigan	280	(1.4)
	Ohio	289	(1.0)
	Utah	283	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>280</b>	
2009	<b>National</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	277	(1.4)
	California	270	(1.3)
	Colorado	287	(1.4)
	Delaware	284	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	254	(0.9)
	Florida	279	(1.1)
	Idaho	287	(0.8)
	Michigan	278	(1.6)
	Ohio	286	(1.0)
	Utah	284	(0.9)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>279</b>	
2007	<b>National</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	276	(1.2)
	California	270	(0.8)
	Colorado	286	(0.9)
	Delaware	283	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	248	(0.9)
	Florida	277	(1.3)
	Idaho	284	(0.9)
	Michigan	277	(1.4)

	Ohio	285	(1.2)
	Utah	281	(0.9)
	<b>TS Average</b>		
<b>2005</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	274	(1.1)
	California	269	(0.6)
	Colorado	281	(1.2)
	Delaware	281	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	245	(0.9)
	Florida	274	(1.1)
	Idaho	281	(0.9)
	Michigan	277	(1.5)
	Ohio	283	(1.1)
	Utah	279	(0.7)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>274</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	271	(1.2)
	California	267	(1.2)
	Colorado	283	(1.1)
	Delaware	277	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	243	(0.8)
	Florida	271	(1.5)
	Idaho	280	(0.9)
	Michigan	276	(2.0)
	Ohio	282	(1.3)
	Utah	281	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>273</b>	
<b>2000</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>
	Arizona	269	(1.8)
	California	260	(2.1)
	Colorado	—	†
	Delaware	—	†
	District of Columbia	235	(1.1)
	Florida	—	†
	Idaho	277	(1.0)
	Michigan	277	(1.9)
	Ohio	281	(1.6)
	Utah	274	(1.2)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>267</b>	
<b>1992<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>(0.9)</b>
	Arizona	265	(1.3)
	California	261	(1.7)
	Colorado	272	(1.0)
	Delaware	263	(1.0)



	District of Columbia	235	(0.9)
	Florida	260	(1.5)
	Idaho	275	(0.7)
	Michigan	267	(1.4)
	Ohio	268	(1.5)
	Utah	274	(0.7)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>264</b>	
<b>1990<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>(1.3)</b>
	Arizona	260	(1.3)
	California	256	(1.3)
	Colorado	267	(0.9)
	Delaware	261	(0.9)
	District of Columbia	231	(0.9)
	Florida	255	(1.2)
	Idaho	271	(0.8)
	Michigan	264	(1.2)
	Ohio	264	(1.0)
	Utah	—	†
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>259</b>	

— Not available.

† Not applicable.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

<sup>1</sup> Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

**NOTE:** The NAEP Mathematics scale ranges from 0 to 500. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1990, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2011 Mathematics Assessments.

## NAEP Reading, Grade 4

### National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

This report was generated using the NAEP Data Explorer. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>

Average scale scores for reading, grade 4 by all students [TOTAL], year and jurisdiction: 2011, 2009, 2007, 2005, 2003, 2002, 2000, 1998, 1994, and 1992

Year	Jurisdiction	All students	
		Average scale score	Standard error
2011	<b>National</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	212	(1.2)
	California	211	(1.8)
	Colorado	223	(1.3)
	Delaware	225	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	201	(0.8)
	Florida	225	(1.1)
	Idaho	221	(0.8)
	Michigan	219	(1.2)
	Ohio	224	(1.0)
	Utah	220	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>218</b>	
2009	<b>National</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	210	(1.2)
	California	210	(1.5)
	Colorado	226	(1.2)
	Delaware	226	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	202	(1.0)
	Florida	226	(1.0)
	Idaho	221	(0.9)
	Michigan	218	(1.0)
	Ohio	225	(1.1)
	Utah	219	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>218</b>	
2007	<b>National</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	210	(1.6)
	California	209	(1.0)
	Colorado	224	(1.1)
	Delaware	225	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	197	(0.9)
	Florida	224	(0.8)
	Idaho	223	(0.8)
	Michigan	220	(1.4)

	Ohio	226	(1.1)
	Utah	221	(1.2)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>218</b>	
<b>2005</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	207	(1.6)
	California	207	(0.7)
	Colorado	224	(1.1)
	Delaware	226	(0.8)
	District of Columbia	191	(1.0)
	Florida	219	(0.9)
	Idaho	222	(0.9)
	Michigan	218	(1.5)
	Ohio	223	(1.4)
	Utah	221	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>216</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	209	(1.2)
	California	206	(1.2)
	Colorado	224	(1.2)
	Delaware	224	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	188	(0.9)
	Florida	218	(1.1)
	Idaho	218	(1.0)
	Michigan	219	(1.2)
	Ohio	222	(1.2)
	Utah	219	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>215</b>	
<b>2002</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>
	Arizona	205	(1.5)
	California	206	(2.5)
	Colorado	—	†
	Delaware	224	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	191	(0.9)
	Florida	214	(1.4)
	Idaho	220	(1.1)
	Michigan	219	(1.1)
	Ohio	222	(1.3)
	Utah	222	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>214</b>	
<b>1998</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>(1.1)</b>
	Arizona	206	(1.4)
	California	202	(2.5)
	Colorado	220	(1.4)
	Delaware	207	(1.7)

	District of Columbia	179	(1.2)
	Florida	206	(1.4)
	Idaho	—	†
	Michigan	216	(1.5)
	Ohio	—	†
	Utah	216	(1.2)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>207</b>	
<b>1994<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>(1.0)</b>
	Arizona	206	(1.9)
	California	197	(1.8)
	Colorado	213	(1.3)
	Delaware	206	(1.1)
	District of Columbia	179	(0.9)
	Florida	205	(1.7)
	Idaho	‡	†
	Michigan	‡	†
	Ohio	—	†
	Utah	217	(1.3)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>203</b>	
<b>1992<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>(0.9)</b>
	Arizona	209	(1.2)
	California	202	(2.0)
	Colorado	217	(1.1)
	Delaware	213	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	188	(0.8)
	Florida	208	(1.2)
	Idaho	219	(0.9)
	Michigan	216	(1.5)
	Ohio	217	(1.3)
	Utah	220	(1.1)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>211</b>	

— Not available.

† Not applicable.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

<sup>1</sup> Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

**NOTE:** The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress Assessments. (NAEP), 1992, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2011

## NAEP Reading, Grade 8

### National Center for Education Statistics (NCES)

Institute of Education Sciences (IES)

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

This report was generated using the NAEP Data Explorer. <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>

Average scale scores for reading, grade 8 by all students [TOTAL], year and jurisdiction: 2011, 2009, 2007, 2005, 2003, 2002, 1998, 1994, and 1992

Year	Jurisdiction	All students	
		Average scale score	Standard error
2011	<b>National</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	260	(1.2)
	California	255	(1.0)
	Colorado	271	(1.4)
	Delaware	266	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	242	(0.9)
	Florida	262	(1.0)
	Idaho	268	(0.7)
	Michigan	265	(0.9)
	Ohio	268	(1.1)
	Utah	267	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>262</b>	
2009	<b>National</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	258	(1.2)
	California	253	(1.2)
	Colorado	266	(0.8)
	Delaware	265	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	242	(0.9)
	Florida	264	(1.2)
	Idaho	265	(0.9)
	Michigan	262	(1.4)
	Ohio	269	(1.3)
	Utah	266	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>261</b>	
2007	<b>National</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	255	(1.2)
	California	251	(0.8)
	Colorado	266	(1.0)
	Delaware	265	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	241	(0.7)
	Florida	260	(1.2)
	Idaho	265	(0.9)
	Michigan	260	(1.2)

	Ohio	268	(1.2)
	Utah	262	(1.0)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>259</b>	
<b>2005</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>(0.2)</b>
	Arizona	255	(1.0)
	California	250	(0.6)
	Colorado	265	(1.1)
	Delaware	266	(0.6)
	District of Columbia	238	(0.9)
	Florida	256	(1.2)
	Idaho	264	(1.1)
	Michigan	261	(1.2)
	Ohio	267	(1.3)
	Utah	262	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>258</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>(0.3)</b>
	Arizona	255	(1.4)
	California	251	(1.3)
	Colorado	268	(1.2)
	Delaware	265	(0.7)
	District of Columbia	239	(0.8)
	Florida	257	(1.3)
	Idaho	264	(0.9)
	Michigan	264	(1.8)
	Ohio	267	(1.3)
	Utah	264	(0.8)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>259</b>	
<b>2002</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>(0.4)</b>
	Arizona	257	(1.3)
	California	250	(1.8)
	Colorado	—	†
	Delaware	267	(0.5)
	District of Columbia	240	(0.9)
	Florida	261	(1.6)
	Idaho	266	(1.1)
	Michigan	265	(1.6)
	Ohio	268	(1.6)
	Utah	263	(1.1)
	<b>TS Average</b>	<b>260</b>	
<b>1998</b>	<b>National</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>(0.8)</b>
	Arizona	260	(1.1)
	California	252	(1.6)
	Colorado	264	(1.0)
	Delaware	254	(1.3)

District of Columbia	236	(2.1)
Florida	255	(1.4)
Idaho	—	†
Michigan	—	†
Ohio	—	†
Utah	263	(1.0)
<b>TS Average</b>	<b>255</b>	

— Not available.

† Not applicable.

‡ Reporting standards not met.

<sup>1</sup> Accommodations were not permitted for this assessment.

**NOTE:** The NAEP Reading scale ranges from 0 to 500. Some apparent differences between estimates may not be statistically significant.

**SOURCE:** U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) 1992, 1994, 1998, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2007, 2009 and 2011 Reading Assessments.

## Appendix C: OHIO Performance Data

**2000-2001**

COUNTY	DISTRICT NAME	DIRN	Read 4th grade 2000-01 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2000-01 % at or above proficient	GRAD 00-01	Performance Index Score 2000-01
Allen County	Lima City	044222	24.7	32.3	63.5	60.2
	Delphos City School District	043885	48.9	54.4	90.1	86.3
	Bluffton Exempted Village Scho	045211	64.4	66.7	92.9	88.5
	Allen East Local School Distri	045757	55.7	53.4	87.6	85.4
	Bath Local School District	045765	59.9	76.6	80.1	85.3
	Elida Local School District	045773	57.3	71.4	88.8	88.1
	Perry Local School District	045781	48.5	58.8	75	80.3
	Shawnee Local School District	045799	66	63.7	90.5	90.3
	Spencerville Local School Dist	045807	65.8	55.7	91.8	83.2
Butler County	Monroe Local Local School Dist	139303	46.3	46.3	93	80.5
	Middletown City School Distric	044404	42.4	46.6	67.5	71.5
	Hamilton City School District	044107	45.1	48.5	69.8	74.1
	Edgewood City School District	046094	68	69.3	85.6	87.2
	Fairfield City School District	046102	66.3	66.2	81.4	89
	Lakota Local School District	046110	71.5	75.7	90.4	92.9
	Madison Local School District	046128	49.6	58.2	79.7	80.6
	New Miami Local School Distric	046136	45.5	33.3	66.7	73.4
	Ross Local School District	046144	72.4	72.9	88.5	96.4
	Talawanda School System	046151	58.5	61.7	83	84.3
Clark County						
	Springfield City	044818	32	37.3	60	62.6
	Greenon Local School District	046235	64.3	61.4	81.1	87.8
	Tecumseh Local School District	046243	53.4	60.9	79	78.5
	Northeastern Local School Dist	046250	60.8	62.1	86.8	85.7
	Northwestern Local School Dist	046268	49.2	53	80.6	80.2
	Southeastern Local School Dist	046276	65.5	72.4	98.4	89.5
	Clark-Shawnee Local School Dis	046284	65.5	75.9	94.2	91.7
Madison County						
	London City School District	044255	39.9	42.6	76.5	74.8
	Jefferson Local School Distric	048256	58.1	56.3	83.6	79.2



<b>Marion County</b>	Jonathan Alder Local School Di	048264	<b>61.3</b>	<b>58.4</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>84.1</b>
	Madison-Plains Local School Di	048272	<b>53.2</b>	<b>63.5</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>84.6</b>
	Marion City School District	044339	<b>39.2</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>68.2</b>
	Elgin Local School District	048413	<b>44.9</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>87.9</b>	<b>78.9</b>
	Pleasant Local School District	048421	<b>64.8</b>	<b>64.4</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>84.8</b>
	Ridgedale Local School Distric	048439	<b>31.5</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>74.6</b>
<b>Richland County</b>	River Valley Local School Dist	048447	<b>54</b>	<b>59.5</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>83.7</b>
	Shelby City School District	044776	<b>53.3</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>81.5</b>
	Mansfield City School District	044297	<b>36.8</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>67.5</b>	<b>62.6</b>
	Clear Fork Valley Local School	049411	<b>63.1</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>83.6</b>
	Crestview Local School Distric	049429	<b>63.7</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>86.1</b>
	Lexington Local School Distric	049437	<b>60.6</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>93.7</b>	<b>86.3</b>
	Lucas Local School District	049445	<b>43.5</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>83.5</b>
	Madison Local	049452	<b>45.5</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>75.3</b>
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local School D	049460	<b>58.1</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>86.7</b>
<b>Scioto County</b>	Ontario Local School District	049478	<b>56.6</b>	<b>68.2</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>88.2</b>
	New Boston Local School Distri	044461	<b>43.6</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>76.9</b>
	Portsmouth City School Distric	044669	<b>38.2</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>67</b>
	Bloom-Vernon Local School Dist	049593	<b>44.8</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>76.6</b>
	Clay Local School District	049601	<b>61.9</b>	<b>73.8</b>	<b>91.7</b>	<b>81.4</b>
	Green Local School District	049619	<b>68.5</b>	<b>79.6</b>	<b>77.6</b>	<b>77.9</b>
	Minford Local School District	049627	<b>54.4</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>80.9</b>
	Northwest Local School Distric	049635	<b>48.4</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>74.5</b>
	Valley Local School District	049643	<b>48.4</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>85.2</b>	<b>75.4</b>
<b>Seneca County</b>	Washington-Nile Local School D	049650	<b>59</b>	<b>64.1</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>77.3</b>
	Wheelersburg Local School Dist	049668	<b>60.5</b>	<b>64.5</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>86.2</b>
	Tiffin City School District	044891	<b>70.5</b>	<b>71.7</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>87.9</b>
	Seneca East Local School Distr	049684	<b>61.9</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>85.8</b>
	Bettsville Local School Distri	049692	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>67.6</b>
	Hopewell-Loudon Local School D	049700	<b>44.3</b>	<b>45.7</b>	<b>95.4</b>	<b>82.1</b>
<b>Tuscarawas County</b>	New Riegel Local School Distri	049718	<b>59</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85.1</b>
	Old Fort Local School District	049726	<b>69.2</b>	<b>76.9</b>	<b>91.4</b>	<b>89.4</b>
	Claymont City School District	043778	<b>38.9</b>	<b>49.4</b>	<b>88.9</b>	<b>74.3</b>
	Dover City School District	043893	<b>71.6</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>91.1</b>

Warren County	Garaway Local School District	050278	68.6	79.1	92.5	92
	Indian Valley Local School Dis	050286	63.6	73.5	93.4	84.8
	New Philadelphia City School D	044487	63.8	69.9	86.6	83.1
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	045542	49.4	59	89.1	82.9
	Strasburg-Franklin Local Schoo	050294	56.5	71.7	91.8	86.8
	Tuscarawas Valley Local School	050302	65.4	56.7	94.2	83.4
	Carlisle Local School District	050419	48.8	60.5	88.7	81.2
	Franklin City School District	044008	52.8	53.3	83.1	79.6
	Kings Local School District	050435	75.8	79	91.2	91
	Lebanon City School District	044214	64.6	65.5	90.6	86.9
	Little Miami Local School Dist	050443	68.7	75.4	84.2	88.9
	Mason City School District	050450	85.9	87.7	91.5	100.9
	Springboro Community City Scho	050427	76.6	77.1	97.1	93.9
	Wayne Local School District	050468	54.1	62.2	89.8	82.5
Significant County Average			55.8	60.0	86.1	82.3
State Average			57.9	61.9	87.5	83.0

## 2001-2002

COUNTY	DISTRICT NAME	DIRN	Math 4th grade 2001- 02 % at or above proficient	Read 4th grade 2001- 02 % at or above proficient	GRAD 01-02	Performance Index Score 2001-02
Allen County	Lima City	044222	37.9	44.4	78.6	68.2
	Elida Local	045773	57.9	74	88.6	86.5
	Perry Local	045781	51.9	48.1	78.9	72.9
	Delphos City	043885	67.1	70.4	73.7	82
	Bluffton Ex Village	045211	62.9	65.1	78	80.2
	Allen East Local	045757	84.5	84.1	97.7	98.8
	Bath Local	045765	89.2	79.8	97.2	100
	Shawnee Local	045799	44	80	76.5	75.3
	Spencerville Local	045807	35.6	48.1	87.3	67.2
Butler County	Middletown City	044404	64.2	74.4	91.1	85.4
	Hamilton City	044107	56.1	50.8	79.4	80.5
	New Miami Local	046136	47.6	51.8	82.8	75.5

Clark County	Talawanda City	046151	<b>40.2</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>99.7</b>	<b>69.4</b>
	Monroe	139303	<b>50.2</b>	<b>59.4</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>76.8</b>
	Edgewood City	046094	<b>80.2</b>	<b>75.4</b>	<b>93.3</b>	<b>91.5</b>
	Fairfield City	046102	<b>64.5</b>	<b>77.5</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>86.4</b>
	Madison Local	046128	<b>62</b>	<b>63.1</b>	<b>74.2</b>	<b>77</b>
	Ross Local	046144	<b>50</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>78.5</b>	<b>78.9</b>
	Lakota Local	046110	<b>51.3</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>79.2</b>
	Springfield City	044818	<b>52.9</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>89.9</b>	<b>80.7</b>
	Mad River-Green Local	046235	<b>49</b>	<b>64.7</b>	<b>74.9</b>	<b>78.7</b>
	Tecumseh Local	046243	<b>75.5</b>	<b>80.2</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>91.5</b>
	Northeastern Local	046250	<b>54</b>	<b>62.3</b>	<b>94.3</b>	<b>78.5</b>
	Southeastern Local	046276	<b>64.5</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>89.6</b>
	Northwestern Local	046268	<b>68.5</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>82.3</b>
	Clark-Shawnee Local	046284	<b>40.9</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>77.9</b>
Madison County	London City	044255	<b>86.8</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>99</b>
	Jefferson Local	048256	<b>58.2</b>	<b>56.4</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>80.3</b>
	Jonathan Alder Local	048264	<b>93.9</b>	<b>85.7</b>	<b>90.2</b>	<b>96.4</b>
	Madison-Plains Local	048272	<b>85.9</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>94.9</b>
Marion County	Marion City	044339	<b>68</b>	<b>75.3</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>90.7</b>
	Elgin Local	048413	<b>50</b>	<b>67.3</b>	<b>84.4</b>	<b>81.2</b>
	Pleasant Local	048421	<b>71.9</b>	<b>98.2</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>98</b>
	Ridgedale Local	048439	<b>61.9</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>71.7</b>
	River Valley Local	048447	<b>69.8</b>	<b>67.4</b>	<b>95.5</b>	<b>83.1</b>
Richland County	Mansfield City	044297	<b>56.1</b>	<b>54.7</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>81.6</b>
	Madison Local	049452	<b>72.2</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>86.6</b>
	Shelby City	044776	<b>59.2</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>84.7</b>	<b>77.4</b>
	Clear Fork Valley Local	049411	<b>34.6</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>71.3</b>
	Crestview Local	049429	<b>65.5</b>	<b>69.3</b>	<b>87.8</b>	<b>85.1</b>
	Lucas Local	049445	<b>66.4</b>	<b>66.9</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>85.5</b>
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	049460	<b>55.8</b>	<b>60.5</b>	<b>97.2</b>	<b>80.5</b>
	Ontario Local	049478	<b>75</b>	<b>78.6</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>91.9</b>
	Lexington Local	049437	<b>72.2</b>	<b>61.1</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>87.2</b>
Scioto County	Portsmouth City	044669	<b>84.1</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>93.1</b>	<b>96.7</b>
	New Boston Local	044461	<b>68.8</b>	<b>74.4</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>88</b>

Seneca County	Bloom-Vernon Local	049593	69.3	79.8	91.1	92
	Green Local	049619	63.9	71.6	96.2	86.9
	Northwest Local	049635	56.9	58.6	93.3	82.2
	Valley Local	049643	44.4	98.9	89.5	66.7
	Washington-Nile Local	049650	64.4	70.5	95.2	82.3
	Clay Local	049601	54.5	65.2	85.8	81.6
	Minford Local	049627	62	57	80	81.5
	Wheelersburg Local	049668	47.7	59.4	87.9	80.9
	Fostoria City	043992	71	72.1	95.3	84.8
	Bettsville Local	049692	84.5	77.6	95.6	89.8
	Tiffin City	044891	57.7	73.1	92.5	91.7
	New Riegel Local	049718	87.2	84.6	100	97.8
	Seneca East Local	049684	87.5	78.6	100	96.1
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	049700	61.5	59	97	87.9
	Old Fort Local	049726	85.7	81	97.6	94.4
Tuscarawas County						
	Claymont City	043778	78.6	73.2	83.3	88.9
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	050294	49.2	63.9	84.7	79.8
	Dover City	043893	66.7	68.5	92.2	80.3
	Newcomerstown Ex Village	045542	80.5	80.5	94.9	91.1
	Indian Valley Local	050286	59.7	76.4	89.9	84.6
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	050302	76.2	82.4	95	92.4
	New Philadelphia City	044487	64.4	72.2	91	83.8
	Garaway Local	050278	67.3	80.6	92.7	91.7
Warren County	Franklin City	044008	76.2	78.2	89.5	93.4
	Carlisle Local	050419	81.3	84.7	89.1	89.7
	Lebanon City	044214	72.4	62.1	87.2	85.4
	Little Miami Local	050443	70.1	84.2	84.4	90
	Wayne Local	050468	42.5	68.5	93.4	85.4
	Springboro Community City	050427	59.4	60.4	98.2	85.7
	Kings Local	050435	67.9	69.2	98.6	93.9
	Mason City	050450	50	73.5	96.5	87.7
Significant Counties Average - State Average			63.9	69.6	90.3	84.9
			64.1	69.8	89.4	85.2

## 2002-2003

COUNTY	DISTRICT NAME	Dirn	Math 4th grade 2002- 03 % at or above proficient	Read 4th grade 2002- 03 % at or above proficient	Preliminary GRAD 02-03	Performance Index Score 2002-03
Allen County	Lima City	044222	31.1	48.5	59.8	67.3
	Delphos City School District	043885	62.5	70.8	90.2	88.7
	Bluffton Exempted Village Scho	045211	64.8	75.8	96.6	92.0
	Allen East Local School Distri	045757	60.0	57.5	94.7	83.8
	Bath Local School District	045765	58.5	65.3	93.4	87.7
	Elida Local School District	045773	56.8	60.6	93.0	88.2
	Perry Local School District	045781	49.0	62.7	88.1	81.5
	Shawnee Local School District	045799	78.4	78.5	90.7	91.3
	Spencerville Local School Dist	045807	59.4	65.2	96.8	89.5
Butler County						
	Monroe Local Local School Dist	139303	69.6	76.5	92.5	90.9
	Middletown City School Distric	044404	45.6	57.7	78.9	77.1
	Hamilton City School District	044107	58.9	71.0	75.0	84.4
	Edgewood City School District	046094	78.5	82.1	92.3	91.9
	Fairfield City School District	046102	72.1	80.3	94.3	91.1
	Lakota Local School District	046110	76.9	82.7	95.9	95.4
	Madison Local School District	046128	55.6	65.9	91.7	87.1
	New Miami Local School Distric	046136	44.6	76.8	76.5	85.4
	Ross Local School District	046144	77.1	76.7	90.6	95.9
Clark County	Talawanda School System	046151	76.4	76.0	85.2	92.1
	Springfield City	044818	36.4	44.8	72.7	65.5
	Greenon Local School District	046235	54.1	67.1	84.7	88.7
	Tecumseh Local School District	046243	57.0	64.3	85.9	80.0
	Northeastern Local School Dist	046250	56.3	61.9	90.1	88.7
	Northwestern Local School Dist	046268	56.3	67.2	96.3	83.9
	Southeastern Local School Dist	046276	57.6	69.5	94.0	80.3
	Clark-Shawnee Local School Dis	046284	60.0	70.3	91.1	87.8
Madison County						
	London City School District	044255	51.1	65.5	80.9	80.9
	Jefferson Local School Distric	048256	53.1	79.6	89.6	80.1
	Jonathan Alder Local School Di	048264	73.9	74.6	91.1	89.3
	Madison-Plains Local School Di	048272	55.7	71.8	94.7	86.1
Marion County						
	Marion City School District	044339	37.5	46.4	79.2	70.3
	Elgin Local School District	048413	56.8	68.3	90.7	83.0
	Pleasant Local School District	048421	71.7	59.8	97.3	90.0
	Ridgedale Local School Distric	048439	53.6	61.9	100.0	80.3
	River Valley Local School Dist	048447	62.4	64.7	97.5	82.6
Richland County						
	Shelby City School District	044776	65.7	69.4	86.2	85.1

<b>Scioto County</b>	Mansfield City School District	044297	31.6	41.7	71.9	66.4
	Clear Fork Valley Local School	049411	55.2	70.1	96.6	84.7
	Crestview Local School Distric	049429	69.3	77.3	91.7	91.5
	Lexington Local School Distric	049437	66.3	75.1	98.7	94.0
	Lucas Local School District	049445	78.6	85.7	100.0	87.9
	Madison Local	049452	51.4	62.2	81.5	81.2
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local School D	049460	55.9	65.2	85.0	86.8
	Ontario Local School District	049478	67.2	79.9	97.9	92.8
	New Boston Local School Distri	044461	40.6	53.1	96.0	76.4
	Portsmouth City School Distric	044669	41.5	48.7	64.0	69.2
	Bloom-Vernon Local School Dist	049593	66.2	84.4	89.0	83.3
	Clay Local School District	049601	70.3	73.0	94.6	88.7
	Green Local School District	049619	66.0	64.2	80.4	82.6
	Minford Local School District	049627	60.9	78.2	91.8	86.8
	Northwest Local School Distric	049635	55.5	65.8	89.6	78.3
	Valley Local School District	049643	43.3	55.7	89.8	78.2
	Washington-Nile Local School D	049650	64.6	71.5	92.5	90.6
	Wheelersburg Local School Dist	049668	65.4	80.8	96.4	88.3
<b>Seneca County</b>	Tiffin City School District	044891	76.1	83.3	81.1	92.0
	Seneca East Local School Distr	049684	73.2	76.8	97.8	91.1
	Bettsville Local School Distri	049692	20.0	50.0	93.9	77.2
	Hopewell-Loudon Local School D	049700	66.1	69.5	94.4	84.2
	New Riegel Local School Distri	049718	56.1	82.9	97.4	89.6
	Old Fort Local School District	049726	68.1	66.0	95.7	91.3
<b>Tuscarawas County</b>						
	Claymont City School District	043778	53.0	59.7	96.8	79.3
	Dover City School District	043893	73.2	80.5	93.7	94.7
	Garaway Local School District	050278	78.6	84.5	99.0	93.5
	Indian Valley Local School Dis	050286	78.4	73.8	95.0	89.4
	New Philadelphia City School D	044487	66.4	71.2	90.3	88.2
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	045542	61.1	70.5	89.1	87.6
	Strasburg-Franklin Local Schoo	050294	73.7	70.2	84.4	92.4
	Tuscarawas Valley Local School	050302	73.3	80.9	94.3	90.5
<b>Warren County</b>	Carlisle Local School District	050419	58.7	63.0	94.1	82.6
	Franklin City School District	044008	50.4	61.9	83.6	81.6
	Kings Local School District	050435	85.5	88.6	92.2	97.7
	Lebanon City School District	044214	83.7	82.5	91.2	95.7
	Little Miami Local School Dist	050443	77.4	82.5	91.3	93.7
	Mason City School District	050450	82.6	88.9	95.9	100.8
	Springboro Community City Scho	050427	77.8	85.0	96.3	95.2
	Wayne Local School District	050468	73.6	78.0	96.9	90.0

Significant County Average  
State Average

61.7	70.0	90.1	86.2
63.1	70.8	90.9	86.8

## 2003-2004

County	District Name	Read 4th grade 2003- 04 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2003-04 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2003-04 % at or above proficient	Read OGT 2003-04 % at or above proficient	Final graduation rate 02-03	Performance Index Score 2003-04
Allen County	Lima	49.9	38.6	49.6	69.5	58.1	70.8
	Bluffton	80.8	74	91.8	93.8	98.3	97.1
	Delphos	78.2	70.5	74.7	81.3	91.1	91.8
	Allen East	64.9	55.4	76.9	91.3	95.7	85.5
	Bath	78.9	74.6	73.2	80.4	92.9	90.9
	Elida	68.9	63.8	70	80.3	94.8	91.5
	Perry	45.8	50	53.1	82.8	89.6	78.1
	Shawnee	81.5	76.9	81.2	83	88.8	95.4
	Spencerville	69.4	56.5	84	95.1	94.7	90.7
Butler County	Monroe	79.3	66.7	64.6	72.4	94.3	91.7
	Middletown	64.7	54.1	51.8	61.4	79.4	79.6
	Hamilton	73.5	70.1	63.2	78.9	76.1	87.8
	Edgewood City School District	79.2	75.5	80.4	86.7	94.7	93.0
	Fairfield	81.4	75.4	77.6	88	95	93.7
	Lakota	87	78.9	85.9	91.5	96.1	98.6
	Madison	75	61.1	73.3	85.3	93.3	88.4
	New Miami	63.6	49.1	45.8	70.8	73.3	81.5
	Ross	79.8	75.1	75	79.3	91.8	97.3
	Talawanda	82.4	81.5	62.3	54.2	85.3	93.9
Clark County	Springfield	45.7	45.3	34.4	48.6	74.3	69.4
	Greenon Local	70.4	70.4	78.5	88	86.5	92.9
	Tecumseh	74.2	61.3	69.4	82.8	85.9	86.0
	Northeastern	68.6	59.4	67	82.8	90.4	87.1
	Northwestern	78.6	67.5	77.3	86.8	96.3	88.2
	Southeastern	91.2	73.7	86.6	86.8	95.7	90.4
	Clark-Shawnee	76.7	64.9	78.4	86.9	93.2	91.3
Madison County	London	75.8	61.4	51.6	51.7	82.1	84.7
	Jefferson	78.9	60	68.1	69.4	84.3	88.6
	Jonathan Alder	80.1	74.3	80	80.8	91.1	94.3
	Madison-Plains	73.6	71.9	70.1	76.4	93.2	90.0

<b>Marion County</b>	Marion	<b>45.3</b>	<b>44.1</b>	58.1	63.0	<b>78.8</b>	<b>70.2</b>
	Elgin	<b>71.4</b>	<b>63.3</b>	66.7	72.8	<b>91.6</b>	<b>81.1</b>
	Pleasant	<b>69.4</b>	<b>73.9</b>	85.3	94.2	<b>96.9</b>	<b>90.2</b>
	Ridgedale Local Schools	<b>64.5</b>	<b>75.8</b>	72.7	81.8	<b>100</b>	<b>87.7</b>
	River Valley	<b>71</b>	<b>68.5</b>	60	78.8	<b>97.5</b>	<b>87.1</b>
<b>Richland County</b>	Shelby	<b>85.0</b>	<b>73.9</b>	73.9	81.1	<b>86.5</b>	<b>95.7</b>
	Mansfield	<b>45.1</b>	<b>39.5</b>	50.1	65.7	<b>73.4</b>	<b>69.3</b>
	Clear Fork Valley	<b>62.5</b>	<b>65.6</b>	68.5	79.6	<b>96.6</b>	<b>86.3</b>
	Crestview Local School District	<b>85.1</b>	<b>76.6</b>	77.8	77.1	<b>90.6</b>	<b>94.1</b>
	Lexington	<b>81.6</b>	<b>77.1</b>	84.3	92.8	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.3</b>
	Lucas Local School District	<b>78.9</b>	<b>73.7</b>	83.9	85.7	<b>100</b>	<b>92.5</b>
	Madison	<b>67</b>	<b>57.7</b>	57.8	70.7	<b>81.5</b>	<b>81.7</b>
	Plymouth-Shiloh	<b>84.4</b>	<b>85.9</b>	81.5	90.4	<b>89.5</b>	<b>96.9</b>
	Ontario	<b>82.9</b>	<b>83.6</b>	86	86.7	<b>95.4</b>	<b>95.9</b>
<b>Scioto County</b>	New Boston	<b>64.0</b>	<b>76.0</b>	61.8	61.8	<b>96.0</b>	<b>84.8</b>
	Portsmouth	<b>43.4</b>	<b>38.2</b>	42.2	66.3	<b>63.1</b>	<b>72.7</b>
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	<b>80.6</b>	<b>79.2</b>	68.1	78.3	<b>87.1</b>	<b>87.9</b>
	Clay	<b>72.2</b>	<b>86.1</b>	67.6	94.6	<b>94.6</b>	<b>98.9</b>
	Green	<b>74</b>	<b>74</b>	68.7	76.1	<b>82.2</b>	<b>89.1</b>
	Minford	<b>76.8</b>	<b>71.7</b>	60.8	82.3	<b>91.8</b>	<b>91.8</b>
	Northwest	<b>76.6</b>	<b>69.1</b>	63.8	74.6	<b>85.8</b>	<b>86.6</b>
	Valley Local School District	<b>70.5</b>	<b>55.7</b>	70.9	82.4	<b>87.8</b>	<b>83.7</b>
	Washington-Nile	<b>80.4</b>	<b>80.4</b>	57.6	80.7	<b>94.1</b>	<b>91.8</b>
	Whealersburg	<b>76.7</b>	<b>79.1</b>	59.3	76.1	<b>97.3</b>	<b>93.3</b>
<b>Seneca County</b>	Tiffin	<b>86.0</b>	<b>82.4</b>	70.6	78.4	<b>81.8</b>	<b>93.6</b>
	Fostoria	<b>69.2</b>	<b>63.9</b>	54.4	74.6	<b>81.5</b>	<b>85.6</b>
	Seneca East	<b>81.1</b>	<b>74.3</b>	90.9	92.1	<b>97.8</b>	<b>92.2</b>
	Bettsville	<b>68.4</b>	<b>47.4</b>	82.8	82.8	<b>94.1</b>	<b>76.3</b>
	Hopewell-Loudon	<b>75</b>	<b>78.1</b>	77.3	84.8	<b>94.6</b>	<b>95.9</b>
	New Riegel	<b>78.9</b>	<b>71.1</b>	85.7	94.3	<b>100</b>	<b>93.2</b>
	Old Fort	<b>75.6</b>	<b>85.4</b>	78.8	82.7	<b>95.7</b>	<b>91.3</b>
<b>Tuscarawas County</b>	Claymont	<b>81.6</b>	<b>72.6</b>	64.2	72.0	<b>96.8</b>	<b>87.4</b>
	Newcomerstown	<b>74.2</b>	<b>55.9</b>	82.6	90.1	<b>89.4</b>	<b>88.5</b>
	Dover	<b>83.6</b>	<b>77.6</b>	81.1	93.0	<b>93.8</b>	<b>93.5</b>
	New Philadelphia	<b>79.7</b>	<b>76.0</b>	68.8	77.7	<b>90.0</b>	<b>95.0</b>



Warren County	Garaway	86.3	82.5	69	87.4	99	97.5
	Indian Valley	86.9	84.1	73.1	91.6	95.1	96.5
	Strasburg-Franklin	77.3	71.4	88.9	87	82.6	92.4
	Tuscarawas Valley	80.2	71.5	81.3	87.7	94.4	92.1
	Franklin	76.6	72.1	72.7	85.6	84.8	89.0
	Lebanon	78.0	82.1	81.8	85.6	91.6	96.6
	Carlisle	86.3	86.3	45.4	74.6	96.6	92.4
	Springboro Community	87	84.2	88.7	94.4	96.3	97.3
	Kings	84.1	87.8	91.9	94.1	91.5	100.2
	Little Miami Local School District	88.6	85.4	82.8	91	88.6	95.1
	Mason	91.9	92.6	88.5	85.3	97.9	104.3
	Wayne	86.1	86.1	85.6	91.3	97.6	98.4
	Target County Average -	77.0	72.2	74.7	83.8	92.6	89.8
	State Average -	76.8	71.2	74.0	83.2	92.5	90.2

## 2004-2005

County	District Name	DIRN	Math 4th grade 2004-05 % at or above proficient	Read 4th grade 2004-05 % at or above proficient	Read 8th grade 2004-05 % at or above proficient	Math 8th grade 2004-05 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2004-05 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos	043885	64.9	83.1	75.3	54.2	83
	Lima	044222	45.7	57.6	62.1	29	47.6
	Bluffton	045211	73.2	85.4	91	83.1	94.5
	Allen East	045757	77.5	85.9	94.1	71.8	88.9
	Bath	045765	67.4	77.1	87.7	80.4	87.3
	Elida	045773	59	76.4	94.1	83.8	89.6
	Perry	045781	51.1	57.4	70.7	53.4	72.4
	Shawnee	045799	76.2	89.5	83.8	75.3	90.4
	Spencerville	045807	64.8	88.7	90.5	82.1	90
Butler	Monroe	139303	78.9	83.3	82.6	68.9	83.2
	Middletown	044404	53.5	64.9	71.2	43.3	73
	Hamilton	044107	68.5	79.3	69.5	42.8	80.9
	Edgewood City	046094	77.4	87.5	84.6	65.2	82.9
	Fairfield	046102	80.5	87.6	86.6	75.7	87
	Lakota	046110	76.1	87.6	92.2	83.7	90.9
	Madison	046128	68.2	80.2	80.8	66.4	82.6

<b>Clark</b>	New Miami	046136	<b>77</b>	<b>78.7</b>	86.1	38.9	75.4
	Ross	046144	<b>69.7</b>	<b>86.7</b>	80.7	64.7	89.7
	Talawanda	046151	<b>59.3</b>	<b>79.9</b>	90	77.8	87.3
	Springfield	044818	<b>44.6</b>	<b>53.7</b>	56.7	46	71.9
	Greenon Local	046235	<b>68.1</b>	<b>78.8</b>	85.2	72.3	87.5
	Tecumseh	046243	<b>58.7</b>	<b>78.3</b>	81.6	65.2	80.8
	Northeastern	046250	<b>58.8</b>	<b>78.4</b>	87.3	73.7	84.4
	Northwestern	046268	<b>59.2</b>	<b>76.8</b>	87.3	72.4	88.3
	Southeastern	046276	<b>66.7</b>	<b>82.5</b>	91.2	50	88.1
<b>Madison</b>	Clark-Shawnee	046284	<b>70.9</b>	<b>81.8</b>	92.6	82.8	85.3
	London	044255	<b>52.2</b>	<b>73.8</b>	83.4	67.5	82.8
	Jefferson	048256	<b>62.8</b>	<b>73.1</b>	84.7	72.9	78.7
	Jonathan Alder	048264	<b>73.6</b>	<b>82.9</b>	88.6	77.9	90.8
<b>Marion</b>	Madison-Plains	048272	<b>63.7</b>	<b>79.4</b>	86.4	58.2	85.8
	Elgin	048413	<b>50.9</b>	<b>60.4</b>	80.7	56.7	78.4
	Pleasant	048421	<b>64</b>	<b>79</b>	90.9	66.9	95.7
	Ridgedale Local Schools	048439	<b>54.8</b>	<b>71</b>	68.4	42.1	90.4
<b>Richland</b>	River Valley	048447	<b>70.9</b>	<b>75.9</b>	88.5	69.8	84.7
	Mansfield	044297	<b>43.7</b>	<b>56.3</b>	65.2	41.1	71.4
	Shelby	044776	<b>68.3</b>	<b>87.2</b>	91.2	80.3	86.7
	Clear Fork Valley	049411	<b>57.5</b>	<b>76</b>	83.8	61.7	86.5
	Crestview Local School District	049429	<b>64.4</b>	<b>86.8</b>	89.2	72	89
	Lexington	049437	<b>79</b>	<b>90.8</b>	89	85.4	87.3
	Lucas Local School District	049445	<b>88.2</b>	<b>87.9</b>	74.4	51.2	93
	Madison	049452	<b>55</b>	<b>71.1</b>	77.1	50.7	81
	Plymouth-Shiloh	049460	<b>80</b>	<b>78.6</b>	85.9	63.5	81.8
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario	049478	<b>88.9</b>	<b>96.3</b>	93.3	53.7	91.3
	New Boston	044461	<b>65.2</b>	<b>82.6</b>	56.3	29	75
	Portsmouth	044669	<b>46.9</b>	<b>68</b>	60	41.1	60.2
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	049593	<b>71.8</b>	<b>83.5</b>	84.4	75.3	77.4
	Clay	049601	<b>68.3</b>	<b>85.4</b>	72.2	33.3	73.8
	Green	049619	<b>67.3</b>	<b>81.6</b>	82	54	63.6
	Minford	049627	<b>73</b>	<b>78.4</b>	90.4	66	79.8
	Northwest	049635	<b>57.4</b>	<b>80.9</b>	82.8	49.6	68
	Valley Local School District	049643	<b>40.6</b>	<b>71</b>	84.9	81.7	78.3
	Washington-Nile	049650	<b>58.9</b>	<b>76.8</b>	78	63	68.6
	Wheelersburg	049668	<b>66.7</b>	<b>74.1</b>	90.7	78.8	82.7

<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin	044891	<b>78.1</b>	<b>88.8</b>	88.7	75	88.9
	Fostoria	043992	<b>58.2</b>	<b>67.1</b>	69.9	46.8	69.6
	Seneca East	049684	<b>71.1</b>	<b>83.3</b>	83.5	69.7	91.7
	Bettsville	049692	<b>76.9</b>	<b>100</b>	88.9	77.8	94.7
	Hopewell-Loudon	049700	<b>83.8</b>	<b>89.7</b>	77.3	62.7	97.3
	New Riegel	049718	<b>43.3</b>	<b>86.7</b>	87.2	76.9	97.2
	Old Fort	049726	<b>78.1</b>	<b>71.9</b>	92.3	79.5	97.2
<b>Tuscarawas</b>							
	Newcomerstown	045542	<b>57</b>	<b>69.2</b>	81.2	49.4	78
	Claymont	043778	<b>77.3</b>	<b>92.9</b>	75	57.6	77.6
	Dover	043893	<b>70.9</b>	<b>86.2</b>	87.8	81.1	89.9
	New Philadelphia	044487	<b>67.2</b>	<b>88.8</b>	86.8	66.7	79.9
	Garaway	050278	<b>76.3</b>	<b>92.8</b>	82.8	75.3	79.3
	Indian Valley	050286	<b>78.1</b>	<b>80.8</b>	82.9	69	82.7
	Strasburg-Franklin	050294	<b>80.3</b>	<b>90.2</b>	89.8	71.4	96.6
<b>Warren</b>	Tuscarawas Valley	050302	<b>64.4</b>	<b>84.8</b>	87	56.5	83.6
	Franklin	044008	<b>58.5</b>	<b>77.7</b>	80	50.5	80.6
	Lebanon	044214	<b>88</b>	<b>89.4</b>	90.2	83.8	88
	Carlisle	050419	<b>70.2</b>	<b>82.6</b>	86.2	52.2	76.9
	Springboro Community	050427	<b>81.3</b>	<b>93.7</b>	92.5	76.2	94
	Kings	050435	<b>88.5</b>	<b>96.3</b>	88.9	80.5	92.3
	Little Miami Local School District	050443	<b>82.9</b>	<b>89.1</b>	84.1	64.7	91.5
	Mason	050450	<b>93.1</b>	<b>93</b>	93.6	90.2	94.8
	Wayne	050468	<b>75.2</b>	<b>88.9</b>	91.9	81.4	83.7
<b>Significant Counties Average -</b>			<b>73.7</b>	<b>86.1</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>69.1</b>	<b>87.1</b>
<b>State Average -</b>			<b>69.2</b>	<b>80.7</b>	<b>83.2</b>	<b>64.8</b>	<b>84.5</b>

### 2004-2005, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Write OGT 2004-05 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Science OGT 2004- 05 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Final graduation rate 2003- 04</b>	<b>Performance Index Score 2004-05</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos	86.4	68.2	<b>90</b>	<b>94.6</b>
	Lima	49.1	36.5	<b>72.9</b>	<b>70.9</b>
	Bluffton	97.8	87.9	<b>97.7</b>	<b>99.9</b>
	Allen East	88.8	85	<b>91.9</b>	<b>95.5</b>
	Bath	88.8	82.8	<b>91.5</b>	<b>93.3</b>
	Elida	92.3	84.6	<b>90.8</b>	<b>95.6</b>
	Perry	87.9	65.5	<b>85.5</b>	<b>84.9</b>
	Shawnee	95	87.2	<b>93.5</b>	<b>100</b>
	Spencerville	88.8	85	<b>94.1</b>	<b>95.1</b>

Butler					
	Monroe	88.1	72.7	93.3	97.1
	Middletown	76.3	57.7	79.4	80.4
	Hamilton	84.2	66.8	79.3	89.2
	Edgewood City	87.2	76.9	93.8	94.9
	Fairfield	88.1	76.1	98.7	97.4
	Lakota	93.4	88.2	96.1	100.9
	Madison	83.5	70.6	95.2	91.3
	New Miami	87.7	53.8	73.4	94.2
	Ross	92.2	82.4	91	98.3
Talawanda	91.2	80.1	91.6	95.2	
Clark	Springfield	72.6	59.7	76.2	74.1
	Greenon Local	95.4	86.8	93.1	96.4
	Tecumseh	83.3	72	86.3	88.5
	Northeastern	87	76.6	94.4	91
	Northwestern	89.7	79.3	92.3	91.1
	Southeastern	89.6	83.6	95.6	91.9
	Clark-Shawnee	88	82.6	93.5	97.2
Madison	London	82.8	70.9	87.1	87.2
	Jefferson	87.6	77.5	92.9	89.8
	Jonathan Alder	80.3	81.6	92	94.7
	Madison-Plains	89.1	75.8	95.8	90.8
Marion	Elgin	85.1	62.7	94.5	83.8
	Pleasant	94.9	82.1	96.8	93.5
	Ridgedale Local Schools	94.5	79.5	97.4	84.5
	River Valley	88.7	78.2	93.8	89.4
Richland	Mansfield	73.3	57	73.9	75.5
	Shelby	81.7	73.9	95.5	96.3
	Clear Fork Valley	91	81.4	88.9	90.1
	Crestview Local School District	85.4	78	88.8	96.9
	Lexington	91.6	83.9	97.7	99
	Lucas Local School District	93	81.4	92.9	95.1
	Madison	79.8	65.3	91.7	84.2
	Plymouth-Shiloh	80.3	74	94.5	93.2
	Ontario	96	85.2	97.9	99.4
Scioto	New Boston	75	85	95	84.6
	Portsmouth	66.4	53.6	61.3	78.6
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	77.4	71	85.1	93
	Clay	83.3	57.1	97.3	89.6

<b>Seneca</b>	Green	61.4	45.5	<b>89.1</b>	<b>87.1</b>
	Minford	81.7	70	<b>98.2</b>	<b>92.7</b>
	Northwest	66.1	54.5	<b>95.9</b>	<b>86</b>
	Valley Local School District	72.5	72.5	<b>94.4</b>	<b>86.2</b>
	Washington-Nile	78.4	53.9	<b>89.1</b>	<b>87.1</b>
	Wheelersburg	93.3	78.8	<b>98.6</b>	<b>94.6</b>
	Tiffin	90.6	84	<b>79.9</b>	<b>98.6</b>
	Fostoria	78.4	64.2	<b>83.1</b>	<b>82.9</b>
	Seneca East	84.7	83.3	<b>98.1</b>	<b>95.7</b>
	Bettsville	89.5	68.4	<b>100</b>	<b>90.5</b>
	Hopewell-Loudon	94.6	84.9	<b>98.6</b>	<b>100.2</b>
	New Riegel	77.8	86.1	<b>97.3</b>	<b>95</b>
	Old Fort	83.3	77.8	<b>95.8</b>	<b>93.5</b>
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Newcomerstown	82.4	71.4	<b>90.4</b>	<b>87.1</b>
	Claymont	88.8	67.1	<b>90.6</b>	<b>94.2</b>
	Dover	89.9	87.2	<b>91.6</b>	<b>98.6</b>
	New Philadelphia	86.2	75.9	<b>95.6</b>	<b>95</b>
	Garaway	86.2	75.9	<b>95.8</b>	<b>96.9</b>
	Indian Valley	87.1	75.3	<b>95.7</b>	<b>96.5</b>
	Strasburg-Franklin	94.9	89.8	<b>95.7</b>	<b>99.7</b>
	Tuscarawas Valley	89.1	84.5	<b>95.2</b>	<b>92.7</b>
<b>Warren</b>					
	Franklin	76.1	63.8	<b>89.2</b>	<b>86.5</b>
	Lebanon	86.4	81	<b>95.3</b>	<b>100.4</b>
	Carlisle	87.7	66.2	<b>94.7</b>	<b>92.7</b>
	Springboro Community	95.6	93.7	<b>98.2</b>	<b>101.7</b>
	Kings	92.7	89.9	<b>90.8</b>	<b>103.3</b>
	Little Miami Local School District	88.5	76.1	<b>89.5</b>	<b>98.1</b>
	Mason	95.2	91	<b>95.4</b>	<b>105.7</b>
	Wayne	89.4	83.7	<b>97.7</b>	<b>97.5</b>
<b>Significant Counties Average -</b>		<b>87.5</b>	<b>79.0</b>	<b>94.3</b>	<b>95.7</b>
<b>State Average -</b>		<b>86.0</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>92.8</b>

## 2005-2006

County	District Name	Number of standards met (out of 25)	Read 4th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Read 8th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Math 8th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos	19	<b>86.8</b>	<b>85.5</b>	84	73.3

<b>Butler</b>	Bluffton	25	<b>89.6</b>	<b>90.9</b>	91.6	90.4
	Lima	3	<b>54.3</b>	<b>56.7</b>	59.8	36.9
	Allen East	22	<b>81.7</b>	<b>82.9</b>	93	80.3
	Bath	23	<b>82.3</b>	<b>85.4</b>	88.3	77.2
	Elida	22	<b>77.2</b>	<b>72.2</b>	88.8	87.7
	Perry	14	<b>69.9</b>	<b>79.5</b>	76.7	65.8
	Shawnee	24	<b>84.0</b>	<b>80.3</b>	88.9	88.4
	Spencerville	19	<b>72.3</b>	<b>70.8</b>	88.2	89.4
	Monroe	23	<b>88.7</b>	<b>90.1</b>	83.7	71.9
	Hamilton	16	<b>79.2</b>	<b>81.6</b>	66.1	57.3
	Middletown	7	<b>61.3</b>	<b>61.3</b>	64.8	48.8
	Edgewood City School District	23	<b>91.7</b>	<b>88.6</b>	82.4	71.6
	Fairfield	24	<b>87.2</b>	<b>90.2</b>	88.4	83.7
	Lakota	25	<b>87.1</b>	<b>84.2</b>	91.1	87.3
	Madison	18	<b>80.4</b>	<b>67.4</b>	71.1	61.2
	New Miami	19	<b>79.0</b>	<b>93.5</b>	68.4	59.2
	Ross	24	<b>84.2</b>	<b>87.8</b>	83.7	78.9
	Talawanda	22	<b>84.0</b>	<b>79.6</b>	88.6	78.9
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield	2	<b>58.5</b>	<b>58</b>	58	46.9
	Greenon Local	23	<b>75.9</b>	<b>79.1</b>	83.2	83.9
	Tecumseh	15	<b>72.8</b>	<b>72</b>	73.3	68.6
	Northeastern	20	<b>81.6</b>	<b>81.6</b>	81.8	71.7
	Northwestern	19	<b>83.6</b>	<b>84.3</b>	83.5	70.5
	Southeastern	23	<b>78.4</b>	<b>86.3</b>	87.3	76.4
	Clark-Shawnee	22	<b>83.6</b>	<b>82.2</b>	89.8	83.9
<b>Madison</b>	London	13	<b>69.8</b>	<b>72.8</b>	76	67.8
	Jefferson	22	<b>84.2</b>	<b>81.2</b>	85.3	77.6
	Jonathan Alder	24	<b>78.4</b>	<b>85.1</b>	85.7	88.6
	Madison-Plains	17	<b>75.3</b>	<b>74.2</b>	84.3	75.2
<b>Marion</b>						
	Elgin	18	<b>78</b>	<b>75.2</b>	75.9	75.9
	Pleasant	22	<b>81.1</b>	<b>81.1</b>	87.2	70.6
	Ridgedale Local Schools	11	<b>55.6</b>	<b>56.9</b>	60.3	42.6
	River Valley	18	<b>71.5</b>	<b>80.5</b>	85.4	68.6
<b>Richland</b>						
	Mansfield	5	<b>53.4</b>	<b>51.6</b>	54.7	44.4
	Shelby	23	<b>82.7</b>	<b>76.3</b>	87	86.4
	Clear Fork Valley	22	<b>84.7</b>	<b>90.7</b>	89.7	78.7
	Crestview Local School District	21	<b>81.1</b>	<b>85.3</b>	83.3	74.5
	Lexington	25	<b>94.1</b>	<b>91.8</b>	89.2	90.5
	Lucas Local School District	22	<b>93.3</b>	<b>82.2</b>	88.2	72.5
	Madison	11	<b>71.6</b>	<b>71.6</b>	68.2	56.4

<b>Scioto</b>	Plymouth-Shiloh	20	<b>84</b>	<b>88</b>	75.7	65.7
	Ontario	24	<b>82.4</b>	<b>85.7</b>	94.3	86.9
	New Boston	15	<b>69</b>	<b>62.1</b>	75	45.8
	Portsmouth	6	<b>53.9</b>	<b>56.7</b>	62.5	36.9
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	20	<b>86.8</b>	<b>88.2</b>	77.2	81
	Clay	16	<b>79.5</b>	<b>69.2</b>	83.7	58.1
	Green	12	<b>67.5</b>	<b>72.5</b>	63.3	51.7
	Minford	20	<b>81.4</b>	<b>87.6</b>	73.5	61.4
	Northwest	13	<b>75.2</b>	<b>78.8</b>	77.4	65.4
	Valley Local School District	16	<b>79.2</b>	<b>83.3</b>	78.8	87.5
	Washington-Nile	11	<b>71.6</b>	<b>76.6</b>	76.9	66.1
	Wheelersburg	22	<b>86.3</b>	<b>90.2</b>	87.9	84.1
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin	22	<b>92.3</b>	<b>94.7</b>	78.6	72.8
	Seneca East	23	<b>79.5</b>	<b>80.8</b>	86.7	74.3
	Bettsville	15	<b>NC</b>	<b>NC</b>	83.3	61.1
	Hopewell-Loudon	24	<b>80</b>	<b>90</b>	81.8	79.2
	New Riegel	25	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>	91.2	82.4
	Old Fort	25	<b>81.5</b>	<b>88.9</b>	91.1	82.2
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont	18	<b>90.3</b>	<b>93.8</b>	79.8	65.9
	Newcomerstown	20	<b>81.3</b>	<b>91.6</b>	86	67.4
	Dover	25	<b>82.5</b>	<b>85.2</b>	91.9	85.4
	New Philadelphia	24	<b>77.2</b>	<b>76.7</b>	88.2	78.9
	Garaway	25	<b>83.3</b>	<b>86.9</b>	96.8	90.5
	Indian Valley	25	<b>91.3</b>	<b>93.7</b>	89.6	76.4
	Strasburg-Franklin	22	<b>80.9</b>	<b>87.2</b>	74.1	65.5
	Tuscarawas Valley	21	<b>87.3</b>	<b>90.7</b>	75	79.2
<b>Warren</b>	Franklin	19	<b>80.6</b>	<b>77.5</b>	75.7	61.6
	Lebanon	24	<b>87.2</b>	<b>89.6</b>	90	81.3
	Carlisle	19	<b>84.6</b>	<b>86.8</b>	82.4	51.9
	Springboro Community	25	<b>93.2</b>	<b>91.2</b>	89.6	84.7
	Kings	25	<b>92.9</b>	<b>90.5</b>	88.1	83.2
	Little Miami Local School District	24	<b>90.4</b>	<b>93.7</b>	82.6	75.8
	Mason	25	<b>96.8</b>	<b>95.7</b>	94.6	91.7
	Wayne	24	<b>94</b>	<b>95.2</b>	89.6	81.7
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>19.5</b>	<b>80.1</b>	<b>81.4</b>	<b>81.6</b>	<b>72.3</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>19.6</b>	<b>80.9</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>81.8</b>	<b>73.8</b>

2005-2006, cont.

County	District Name	Read OGT 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Write OGT 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Science OGT 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Read 11th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos	94	79.8	90.5	64.3	98.9
	Bluffton	97.9	98.9	96.8	91.5	96.8
	Lima	76.6	62.1	80.1	47.7	81.4
	Allen East	90.4	82.2	94.5	78.1	100
	Bath	92.9	95.7	89.2	82	94.4
	Elida	93.5	90.6	95.9	81.8	98.5
	Perry	85.9	81.3	85.9	65.6	92.5
	Shawnee	95.4	90.7	92.6	85.2	95
	Spencerville	95.1	90.2	92.7	86.6	95.1
Butler						
	Monroe	93.8	86.4	93.2	75.9	98.5
	Hamilton	87.9	83.6	88.8	69.4	97.3
	Middletown	86.7	72.4	83.9	62.2	90.5
	Edgewood City School District	88.6	86.7	90.4	75.4	95
	Fairfield	94.8	88.6	92.2	77.5	97.6
	Lakota	96.1	92.7	94.8	88	97.4
	Madison	94.1	91.2	87.3	78.4	96.3
	New Miami	86.8	83	98.1	71.7	96.8
	Ross	92.7	92.7	97.6	80.5	99
	Talawanda	93.2	89.9	91.6	82.7	96.3
Clark	Springfield	71.1	65.4	71.4	53.7	88.2
	Greenon Local	94	85.6	89.8	77.2	98.6
	Tecumseh	89.6	85.8	87.2	77.2	96
	Northeastern	95.3	88	93.7	81.7	96.8
	Northwestern	90.1	87	85.8	80.1	95.7
	Southeastern	98.5	90.8	95.3	85.9	95.5
	Clark-Shawnee	94.9	83.8	94.9	80.8	97.7
Madison	London	93.1	83.8	91.5	79.2	92.1
	Jefferson	90.4	85.6	88.5	76.9	98.9
	Jonathan Alder	94.1	93.3	89.6	85.9	96.6
	Madison-Plains	88.9	81.5	86.7	69.6	97.4
Marion	Elgin	89.8	79.1	86.7	69.5	89.9
	Pleasant	89.3	83.6	85.2	82	98.2
	Ridgedale Local Schools	89.7	77.8	81.7	71.4	94.5
	River Valley	94.8	91.9	90.4	76.1	97
Richland	Mansfield	84.2	73.8	82.9	65.1	89.4
	Shelby	93.5	92.9	89.6	81.4	93.7



<b>Scioto</b>	Clear Fork Valley	96.2	91.1	94.3	84.1	96.1
	Crestview Local School District	89.7	85.2	86.9	75	98.9
	Lexington	95.4	93.9	96.2	88.5	96.6
	Lucas Local School District	90	82	94	76	100
	Madison	88.3	82.9	85.8	61.1	93.2
	Plymouth-Shiloh	87.3	78.5	89.9	69.6	97
	Ontario	98.5	95.6	97.8	86.8	98.7
	New Boston	92.9	75	85.7	64.3	94.1
	Portsmouth	83	75.5	83	66	88.3
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	88.3	84.4	89.6	68.8	95.2
	Clay	96	88	88	78	92.9
	Green	89.4	78.7	85.1	63.8	88.9
	Minford	92.8	86.4	91.2	79.2	94.8
	Northwest	86	82.6	88.2	61.3	87.5
<b>Seneca</b>	Valley Local School District	94.3	92	93.2	89.8	89.2
	Washington-Nile	87.9	79.4	89.7	63.6	87.6
	Wheelersburg	96.8	89.4	94.7	87.2	93.2
	Tiffin	96.8	88.4	89.8	78.7	97.6
	Seneca East	94.8	87	93.5	84.2	91.5
	Bettsville	100	94.7	89.5	84.2	100
	Hopewell-Loudon	100	94.8	97.4	93.5	100
	New Riegel	93.8	90.6	100	90.6	97.2
	Old Fort	96.2	92.5	92.5	79.2	97.6
<b>Tuscarawas</b>						
	Claymont	91.3	82.5	92.5	76.9	93
	Newcomerstown	88.8	86.7	89.8	76.5	94.3
	Dover	97.4	94.7	95.2	89.9	95.2
	New Philadelphia	93.2	87.3	91.1	77.7	94.5
	Garaway	97.9	91.6	96.8	84.2	95.2
	Indian Valley	96.7	89.3	95	82.5	94.6
	Strasburg-Franklin	100	96.6	96.6	96.6	98.3
<b>Warren</b>	Tuscarawas Valley	92.7	86.8	91.4	86.1	95.3
	Franklin	84	77	85	65.8	93.1
	Lebanon	90.4	87.8	87.3	81	96.4
	Carlisle	91.9	82.9	89.3	83.6	97.7
	Springboro Community	97.7	92.7	97.1	94.2	98.4
	Kings	94.9	92.8	95.2	90.7	96.8
	Little Miami Local School District	94.5	91.8	90	75.8	96.5
	Mason	98.8	96.8	97.8	95.7	99.1

Wayne	97.9	86.9	94.5	77.9	97.8
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>90.8</b>	<b>78.0</b>	<b>95.3</b>
<b>State Average</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>90.6</b>	<b>78.4</b>	<b>95.5</b>

### 2005-2006, cont.

County	District Name	Write 11th grade 2005- 06 % at or above proficient	Social Studies 11th grade 2005- 06 % at or above proficient	Science 11th grade 2005-06 % at or above proficient	Final graduation rate 2004- 05	Performance Index Score 2005-06
Allen	Delphos	97.8	92.2	87.8	<b>93.8</b>	<b>97.6</b>
	Bluffton	97.9	95.7	95.7	<b>96</b>	<b>103.7</b>
	Lima	80.1	64.8	56.3	<b>69.8</b>	<b>77.8</b>
	Allen East	95.9	93.3	90.7	<b>93.7</b>	<b>97.8</b>
	Bath	95.2	92.8	89.6	<b>96.7</b>	<b>99</b>
	Elida	96.6	91.8	92.3	<b>88.6</b>	<b>97</b>
	Perry	90.6	86.8	83	<b>85.9</b>	<b>90.4</b>
	Shawnee	94.6	91.9	92.3	<b>92.5</b>	<b>102</b>
	Spencerville	91.5	91.5	89	<b>90.6</b>	<b>97.3</b>
Butler	Monroe	98.5	91.1	94.1	<b>92.1</b>	<b>99.3</b>
	Hamilton	95.5	89.1	84.2	<b>73.3</b>	<b>92.4</b>
	Middletown	89.7	83.6	76	<b>81.1</b>	<b>84.8</b>
	Edgewood City School District	94.1	92.9	87.4	<b>93</b>	<b>97.5</b>
	Fairfield	96.3	93.4	90.5	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
	Lakota	96.7	94.9	92.2	<b>95.7</b>	<b>103.2</b>
	Madison	96.3	92.7	84.4	<b>93.5</b>	<b>94.5</b>
	New Miami	100	87.1	90.3	<b>72.9</b>	<b>97.8</b>
	Ross	98.5	91.6	93.1	<b>91.3</b>	<b>99.6</b>
	Talawanda	97.1	94.2	90.5	<b>86.3</b>	<b>99.8</b>
Clark	Springfield	84.5	76.9	73.2	<b>83</b>	<b>77.5</b>
	Greenon Local	98.6	97.3	92.6	<b>90.7</b>	<b>98.3</b>
	Tecumseh	91.6	90.6	88.1	<b>85.7</b>	<b>92.8</b>
	Northeastern	95.6	89.3	89.3	<b>93.2</b>	<b>95.8</b>
	Northwestern	93.5	92	91.3	<b>93.9</b>	<b>95.4</b>
	Southeastern	95.5	90.9	87.9	<b>94.9</b>	<b>99</b>
	Clark-Shawnee	95.5	89.8	90.4	<b>94.2</b>	<b>98.2</b>
Madison	London	90.7	83	79.6	<b>88.6</b>	<b>90.6</b>
	Jefferson	96.6	89.7	89.7	<b>90</b>	<b>95.5</b>
	Jonathan Alder	91.9	90.5	89.2	<b>89</b>	<b>100.8</b>
	Madison-Plains	98.3	91.4	88.8	<b>91.2</b>	<b>92.4</b>
Marion	Elgin	87.5	80	77.3	<b>90.1</b>	<b>92.3</b>

<b>Richland</b>	Pleasant	96.5	93	90.4	<b>97.3</b>	<b>97</b>
	Ridgedale Local Schools	93.2	80.6	86.3	<b>96.4</b>	<b>86</b>
	River Valley	93.3	95.5	88.1	<b>95.7</b>	<b>94</b>
	Mansfield	87.4	79.1	75.2	<b>79.9</b>	<b>80.5</b>
	Shelby	89	85.6	78.2	<b>95.7</b>	<b>97.8</b>
	Clear Fork Valley	94.2	90.4	89.1	<b>97.6</b>	<b>98.9</b>
	Crestview Local School District	92.9	92	92	<b>94.6</b>	<b>97.6</b>
	Lexington	97	94.9	89.9	<b>94.2</b>	<b>102.9</b>
	Lucas Local School District	97.6	90.2	92.7	<b>87.2</b>	<b>99.3</b>
	Madison	93.2	86.4	78.2	<b>87.9</b>	<b>88.9</b>
	Plymouth-Shiloh	95.5	90.9	83.3	<b>95.1</b>	<b>94.2</b>
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario	96.7	95.4	96.7	<b>97.9</b>	<b>101.1</b>
	New Boston	82.4	88.2	94.1	<b>100</b>	<b>87.9</b>
	Portsmouth	83.8	78.4	65.8	<b>81.5</b>	<b>81</b>
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	92.1	88.9	82.5	<b>89.4</b>	<b>97.5</b>
	Clay	88.1	85.7	81	<b>94.9</b>	<b>93.2</b>
	Green	84.4	75.6	82.2	<b>88.7</b>	<b>91.4</b>
	Minford	90.6	86.5	86.5	<b>96.4</b>	<b>95</b>
	Northwest	85.8	75.8	67.2	<b>97.7</b>	<b>89.9</b>
	Valley Local School District	90.8	83.1	75.8	<b>91.7</b>	<b>95.5</b>
	Washington-Nile	88.6	73.3	68.6	<b>90.7</b>	<b>87.7</b>
	Wheelersburg	93.2	91.3	86.4	<b>98.9</b>	<b>98.3</b>
<b>Seneca</b>						
	Tiffin	96.4	94.4	93.2	<b>87.8</b>	<b>100.3</b>
	Seneca East	93.9	87.8	90.2	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.1</b>
	Bettsville	89.5	78.9	89.5	<b>100</b>	<b>95.6</b>
	Hopewell-Loudon	100	98.7	97.4	<b>95.9</b>	<b>101.1</b>
	New Riegel	97.2	97.2	94.4	<b>97.3</b>	<b>102.1</b>
	Old Fort	97.6	97.6	92.7	<b>100</b>	<b>101.8</b>
<b>Tuscarawas</b>						
	Claymont	91.7	88.5	83.4	<b>88.9</b>	<b>95.7</b>
	Newcomerstown	90.7	87.2	88.4	<b>87.9</b>	<b>96.1</b>
	Dover	92.8	91.4	90.4	<b>91.6</b>	<b>101.2</b>
	New Philadelphia	91.8	85.8	85.8	<b>92.9</b>	<b>98.2</b>
	Garaway	92.9	89.3	86.9	<b>96.7</b>	<b>103</b>
	Indian Valley	93.2	89.1	87	<b>98.4</b>	<b>100.5</b>
	Strasburg-Franklin	98.3	96.6	91.5	<b>96.2</b>	<b>100.3</b>
	Tuscarawas Valley	92.5	91.6	87.9	<b>97.5</b>	<b>97.4</b>
<b>Warren</b>						
	Franklin	92	86.1	86.2	<b>93.2</b>	<b>92</b>
	Lebanon	93.4	92.8	87.3	<b>94.5</b>	<b>99.9</b>

Carlisle	95.3	90.6	86.7	<b>98.2</b>	<b>94.1</b>
Springboro Community	98.1	97.2	97.2	<b>97.3</b>	<b>103.9</b>
Kings	96.8	95.5	94.7	<b>90.3</b>	<b>104.4</b>
Little Miami Local School District	93	88.3	88.6	<b>92.6</b>	<b>100.5</b>
Mason	98.1	97.7	95.2	<b>98.3</b>	<b>108.5</b>
Wayne	95.6	89.1	88.4	<b>94.5</b>	<b>101.3</b>
<b>Target Counties Average</b>	<b>93.5</b>	<b>89.1</b>	<b>86.8</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>96.2</b>
<b>State Average</b>	<b>94.0</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>96.5</b>

## 2006-2007

County	District Name	Number of standards met (out of 30)	Read 4th grade 2006-07 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2006-07 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	22	<b>94.8</b>	<b>92.7</b>
	Lima	5	<b>73.2</b>	<b>64.1</b>
	Bluffton	30	<b>84.0</b>	<b>77.8</b>
	Allen East	26	<b>88.3</b>	<b>80.0</b>
	Bath	26	<b>83.9</b>	<b>82.2</b>
	Elida	26	<b>78.8</b>	<b>75.7</b>
	Perry	9	<b>66.1</b>	<b>67.9</b>
	Shawnee	28	<b>92.6</b>	<b>83.6</b>
	Spencerville	26	<b>86.0</b>	<b>82.5</b>
Butler	Monroe	26	<b>90.1</b>	<b>88.7</b>
	Middletown	6	<b>70.3</b>	<b>62.0</b>
	Hamilton	19	<b>84.3</b>	<b>82.0</b>
	Edgewood City School District	25	<b>86.0</b>	<b>84.6</b>
	Fairfield	27	<b>86.2</b>	<b>86.6</b>
	Lakota	29	<b>90.8</b>	<b>85.3</b>
	Madison	19	<b>73.2</b>	<b>70.5</b>
	New Miami	23	<b>92.2</b>	<b>92.2</b>
	Ross	27	<b>92.3</b>	<b>90.8</b>
	Talawanda	26	<b>89.3</b>	<b>89.4</b>
Clark	Springfield	3	<b>58.7</b>	<b>58.2</b>
	Greenon Local	26	<b>83.6</b>	<b>77.6</b>
	Tecumseh	18	<b>80.7</b>	<b>69.8</b>
	Northeastern	23	<b>81.7</b>	<b>79.1</b>
	Northwestern	23	<b>79.8</b>	<b>71.0</b>
	Southeastern	28	<b>95.4</b>	<b>83.1</b>
	Clark-Shawnee	27	<b>85.4</b>	<b>79.5</b>

Madison				
	London	16	68.0	65.6
	Jefferson	22	83.7	88.4
	Jonathan Alder	29	90.1	91.5
	Madison-Plains	19	82.1	74.7
Marion				
	Marion	6	59.3	55.1
	Elgin	18	85.8	71.7
	Pleasant	24	81.2	65.3
	Ridgedale Local Schools	7	65.7	61.2
	River Valley	23	75.9	74.4
Richland				
	Mansfield	5	63.5	50.0
	Shelby	25	91.1	78.8
	Clear Fork Valley	29	91.9	94.1
	Crestview Local School District	26	88.5	86.2
	Lexington	28	94.7	86.7
	Lucas Local School District	23	87.5	92.5
	Madison	14	77.4	68.7
	Plymouth-Shiloh	24	86.7	88.3
	Ontario	27	88.4	81.8
Scioto				
	New Boston	16	76.0	76.0
	Portsmouth	4	59.3	53.9
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	26	93.4	82.9
	Clay	16	79.6	65.3
	Green	15	82.1	75.0
	Minford	22	80.2	78.4
	Northwest	15	78.2	74.2
	Valley Local School District	19	69.9	71.2
	Washington-Nile	14	64.7	70.6
Seneca	Wheelersburg	27	85.3	80.2
	Tiffin	26	93.5	91.5
	Fostoria	11	74.4	72.7
	Seneca East	27	81.6	81.6
	Bettsville	21	93.8	87.5
	Hopewell-Loudon	26	87.7	89.5
	New Riegel	26	100.0	88.5
Tuscarawas	Old Fort	28	89.7	87.2
	Claymont	22	96.2	91.7
	Newcomerstown	20	80.0	74.1
	Dover	27	81.5	80.0
	New Philadelphia	25	82.0	80.1
	Garaway	28	89.0	87.2
	Indian Valley	24	85.5	88.3

<b>Warren</b>	Strasburg-Franklin	25	<b>85.4</b>	<b>73.2</b>
	Tuscarawas Valley	27	<b>80.1</b>	<b>81.6</b>
	Lebanon	28	<b>86.9</b>	<b>90.2</b>
	Franklin	20	<b>86.7</b>	<b>81.5</b>
	Carlisle	23	<b>83.2</b>	<b>81.7</b>
	Springboro Community	29	<b>95.6</b>	<b>91.7</b>
	Kings	29	<b>94.8</b>	<b>94.5</b>
	Little Miami Local School District	28	<b>92.9</b>	<b>91.2</b>
	Mason	30	<b>96.6</b>	<b>95.8</b>
<b>Sig Counties Avg</b>	Wayne	30	<b>91.0</b>	<b>86.5</b>
		<b>22.0</b>	<b>83.5</b>	<b>79.6</b>
	<b>State Average</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>84.2</b>	<b>80.6</b>

### 2006-2007, cont

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Science 8th grade 2006- 07 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Read OGT 2006-07 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Math OGT 2006-07 % at or above proficient</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	71.6	87.0	84.4
	Lima	43.0	73.2	54.2
	Bluffton	88.5	97.6	95.2
	Allen East	75.0	97.9	88.7
	Bath	79.4	95.9	92.5
	Elida	78.8	87.2	86.8
	Perry	60.3	73.2	75.0
	Shawnee	77.0	91.3	88.8
	Spencerville	71.8	93.2	88.6
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe	76.2	94.3	86.4
	Middletown	44.0	80.7	69.0
	Hamilton	47.6	84.9	83.3
	Edgewood City School District	67.0	91.1	84.4
	Fairfield	75.1	93.4	89.9
	Lakota	83.9	95.6	92.2
	Madison	66.7	87.1	87.9
	New Miami	68.4	86.3	87.7
	Ross	81.0	91.8	92.7
	Talawanda	73.6	91.7	88.5
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield	32.5	76.8	69.5
	Greenon Local	73.2	92.8	89.2
	Tecumseh	56.3	83.1	81.3
	Northeastern	67.6	90.0	86.0
	Northwestern	72.6	93.6	90.1

<b>Madison</b>	Southeastern	77.9	93.9	97.0
	Clark-Shawnee	79.3	90.9	87.3
	London	49.7	86.3	79.9
	Jefferson	61.9	90.3	78.5
	Jonathan Alder	79.4	90.6	91.2
	Madison-Plains	58.3	93.3	84.9
<b>Marion</b>				
	Marion	45.8	76.5	75.8
	Elgin	65.5	77.9	68.3
	Pleasant	79.0	96.2	90.9
	Ridgedale Local Schools	37.7	82.9	72.0
<b>Richland</b>	River Valley	77.0	91.2	89.7
	Mansfield	37.3	77.7	72.3
	Shelby	84.0	91.9	88.8
	Clear Fork Valley	75.7	91.2	85.5
	Crestview Local School District	76.6	95.5	94.4
	Lexington	78.6	94.8	91.9
	Lucas Local School District	62.5	95.5	86.4
	Madison	58.1	88.8	81.8
	Plymouth-Shiloh	62.2	92.0	86.4
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario	86.3	96.5	93.1
	New Boston	45.5	83.3	80.0
	Portsmouth	43.3	67.7	62.6
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	69.6	89.3	92.0
	Clay	54.1	87.7	77.2
	Green	60.0	87.0	82.6
	Minford	67.2	92.2	83.5
	Northwest	65.2	78.9	76.6
	Valley Local School District	59.8	87.9	90.1
	Washington-Nile	65.5	85.3	83.3
<b>Seneca</b>	Wheelersburg	80.8	89.2	89.2
	Tiffin	73.0	91.7	87.7
	Fostoria	54.2	81.8	70.1
	Seneca East	82.3	92.8	89.8
	Bettsville	70.6	100.0	100.0
	Hopewell-Loudon	71.9	93.2	93.2
	New Riegel	84.8	92.5	92.5
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Old Fort	64.0	95.3	97.6
	Claymont	59.4	79.2	82.0
	Newcomerstown	57.3	89.7	88.2
	Dover	83.3	93.6	91.9
	New Philadelphia	77.8	87.7	84.5

Warren	Garaway	84.3	92.6	88.3
	Indian Valley	72.4	89.8	84.3
	Strasburg-Franklin	83.9	85.1	83.0
	Tuscarawas Valley	67.6	97.4	92.3
	Lebanon	82.8	94.2	88.1
	Franklin	51.3	87.6	85.3
	Carlisle	71.3	90.6	86.2
	Springboro Community	81.4	95.9	93.2
	Kings	76.6	94.7	93.2
	Little Miami Local School District	75.0	90.6	88.2
	Mason	92.2	95.8	96.0
Sig Counties Avg State Average	Wayne	87.0	95.3	95.3
		<b>68.6</b>	<b>89.3</b>	<b>85.7</b>
		<b>69.8</b>	<b>89.8</b>	<b>86.0</b>

### 2006-2007, cont.

County	District Name	Read 11th grade 2006- 07 % at or above proficient	Math 11th grade 2006-07 % at or above proficient	Write 11th grade 2006-07 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	96.4	91.6	91.6
	Lima	83.8	74.3	88.8
	Bluffton	98.9	98.9	98.9
	Allen East	93.9	95.5	100.0
	Bath	93.5	96.0	95.2
	Elida	95.0	94.4	95.5
	Perry	85.0	83.3	85.0
	Shawnee	95.7	92.9	96.2
	Spencerville	93.9	93.9	93.9
Butler	Monroe	97.4	93.4	98.7
	Middletown	92.4	85.6	91.8
	Hamilton	94.1	93.5	94.8
	Edgewood City School District	93.9	93.1	94.9
	Fairfield	96.3	92.9	96.6
	Lakota	97.6	95.9	98.0
	Madison	95.9	96.9	96.9
	New Miami	92.9	94.6	98.2
	Ross	96.8	97.6	98.4
	Talawanda	95.2	93.5	96.4
Clark	Springfield	82.3	76.4	83.6
	Greenon Local	98.7	95.5	98.1



<b>Madison</b>	Tecumseh	91.9	91.4	92.4
	Northeastern	95.9	94.2	95.9
	Northwestern	92.9	90.3	93.5
	Southeastern	98.3	94.9	98.3
	Clark-Shawnee	96.9	93.8	97.9
	London	94.1	92.6	96.3
	Jefferson	95.2	91.3	95.2
	Jonathan Alder	96.9	94.6	95.3
	Madison-Plains	93.8	95.4	96.2
<b>Marion</b>				
	Marion	85.6	81.3	87.1
	Elgin	94.8	90.4	95.7
	Pleasant	94.2	91.7	93.3
	Ridgedale Local Schools	85.7	80.5	88.3
<b>Richland</b>	River Valley	95.5	94.7	97.7
	Mansfield	87.8	82.4	89.3
	Shelby	94.4	94.9	96.6
	Clear Fork Valley	98.7	96.7	98.7
	Crestview Local School District	92.7	91.5	92.7
	Lexington	97.6	95.6	98.4
	Lucas Local School District	96.1	88.2	96.1
	Madison	94.3	90.5	94.3
	Plymouth-Shiloh	87.5	87.5	93.1
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario	98.5	96.3	99.3
	New Boston	93.5	80.6	90.3
	Portsmouth	84.9	82.1	89.6
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	92.6	85.3	89.7
	Clay	95.7	89.4	87.2
	Green	84.3	76.5	86.3
	Minford	96.0	94.4	96.0
	Northwest	85.5	84.7	88.5
	Valley Local School District	97.5	96.3	97.5
<b>Seneca</b>	Washington-Nile	90.2	85.7	93.8
	Wheelersburg	95.8	91.7	95.8
	Tiffin	96.5	94.5	97.0
	Fostoria	91.8	86.9	91.8
	Seneca East	97.5	95.0	100.0
	Bettsville	100.0	100.0	94.7
	Hopewell-Loudon	100.0	97.4	100.0
	New Riegel	100.0	100.0	100.0
	Old Fort	98.0	98.0	98.0
<b>Tuscarawas</b>				
	Claymont	94.9	91.8	96.2

Warren	Newcomerstown	93.2	90.9	93.2
	Dover	97.9	95.7	98.4
	New Philadelphia	94.5	95.0	96.8
	Garaway	98.7	94.9	98.7
	Indian Valley	97.5	92.6	95.1
	Strasburg-Franklin	100.0	98.2	100.0
	Tuscarawas Valley	95.5	94.5	96.4
	Lebanon	93.6	92.9	93.2
	Franklin	87.5	83.0	90.3
	Carlisle	91.4	87.1	92.2
	Springboro Community	98.8	98.5	99.1
	Kings	97.6	95.8	97.6
	Little Miami Local School District	98.6	95.3	99.1
Sig Counties Avg State Average	Mason	98.9	97.8	98.9
	Wayne	98.3	95.8	98.3
		<b>94.4</b>	<b>91.8</b>	<b>95.0</b>
		<b>94.9</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>95.4</b>

### 2006-2007, cont.

County	District Name	Final graduation rate 2005- 06	Performance Index Score 2006-07	Mean ACT Score 2005-06
Allen	Delphos City	84.5	97.4	20.8
	Lima	65.5	78.6	17.4
	Bluffton	98.0	104.1	22.9
	Allen East	97.9	95.8	20.6
	Bath	92.4	97.5	21.4
	Elida	94.8	96.0	21.9
	Perry	86.4	86.4	20.8
	Shawnee	94.6	101.0	22
	Spencerville	95.3	98.4	22.8
Butler				
	Monroe	95.9	97.8	20.1
	Middletown	80.5	82.5	20
	Hamilton	70.6	91.7	20.3
	Edgewood City School District	88.9	96.8	21.4
	Fairfield	98.5	99.2	22.1
	Lakota	95.3	102.5	23.3
	Madison	93.1	92.2	20.3
	New Miami	77.8	95.7	19.8
	Ross	93.6	98.5	21.9
	Talawanda	90.8	99.1	22.8

<b>Clark</b>	Springfield	<b>80.0</b>	<b>79.0</b>	19.8
	Greenon Local	<b>93.2</b>	<b>97.4</b>	21.6
	Tecumseh	<b>84.5</b>	<b>90.7</b>	21.5
	Northeastern	<b>95.9</b>	<b>93.9</b>	21.3
	Northwestern	<b>96.1</b>	<b>95.4</b>	22.2
	Southeastern	<b>96.9</b>	<b>100.2</b>	20.9
	Clark-Shawnee	<b>92.1</b>	<b>98.1</b>	21.9
<b>Madison</b>	London	<b>85.6</b>	<b>89.1</b>	19.9
	Jefferson	<b>92.9</b>	<b>93.0</b>	22.1
	Jonathan Alder	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.6</b>	22.3
	Madison-Plains	<b>90.8</b>	<b>90.9</b>	20.6
<b>Marion</b>	Marion	<b>77.0</b>	<b>81.8</b>	20.7
	Elgin	<b>91.0</b>	<b>89.3</b>	20.8
	Pleasant	<b>97.1</b>	<b>96.3</b>	21.3
	Ridgedale Local Schools	<b>97.2</b>	<b>82.4</b>	21.2
	River Valley	<b>93.8</b>	<b>93.7</b>	20.6
<b>Richland</b>	Mansfield	<b>84.6</b>	<b>78.5</b>	18.7
	Shelby	<b>88.4</b>	<b>97.4</b>	21.4
	Clear Fork Valley	<b>95.8</b>	<b>97.6</b>	21.4
	Crestview Local School District	<b>92.0</b>	<b>98.1</b>	21.4
	Lexington	<b>98.2</b>	<b>100.1</b>	23
	Lucas Local School District	<b>96.1</b>	<b>93.7</b>	20.4
	Madison	<b>90.4</b>	<b>88.8</b>	20.4
	Plymouth-Shiloh	<b>95.0</b>	<b>95.0</b>	21.1
	Ontario	<b>97.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>	22.4
<b>Scioto</b>	New Boston	<b>100.0</b>	<b>88.3</b>	19.6
	Portsmouth	<b>92.6</b>	<b>78.8</b>	20.9
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	<b>92.6</b>	<b>98.4</b>	20.5
	Clay	<b>94.6</b>	<b>89.7</b>	20.1
	Green	<b>94.4</b>	<b>89.9</b>	19
	Minford	<b>93.8</b>	<b>93.9</b>	20.8
	Northwest	<b>98.4</b>	<b>90.0</b>	19.1
	Valley Local School District	<b>98.1</b>	<b>93.3</b>	20.4
	Washington-Nile	<b>93.4</b>	<b>90.0</b>	19.4
	Wheelersburg	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99.0</b>	20.6
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin	<b>88.9</b>	<b>99.5</b>	22
	Fostoria	<b>69.9</b>	<b>87.8</b>	19.4
	Seneca East	<b>98.7</b>	<b>98.6</b>	20.7
	Bettsville	<b>100.0</b>	<b>93.6</b>	21.6
	Hopewell-Loudon	<b>98.5</b>	<b>98.2</b>	20.8
	New Riegel	<b>100.0</b>	<b>99.5</b>	22
	Old Fort	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.3</b>	21.3

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont	<b>92.7</b>	<b>93.7</b>	20.2
	Newcomerstown	<b>93.1</b>	<b>91.4</b>	21.7
	Dover	<b>96.9</b>	<b>99.7</b>	21.5
	New Philadelphia	<b>90.6</b>	<b>96.8</b>	21.8
	Garaway	<b>93.3</b>	<b>101.9</b>	22.5
	Indian Valley	<b>100.0</b>	<b>97.4</b>	21.1
	Strasburg-Franklin	<b>98.1</b>	<b>97.3</b>	21.1
	Tuscarawas Valley	<b>93.3</b>	<b>98.0</b>	22.5
<b>Warren</b>	Lebanon	<b>92.5</b>	<b>100.2</b>	21.7
	Franklin	<b>92.0</b>	<b>92.8</b>	19.3
	Carlisle	<b>96.7</b>	<b>93.5</b>	19.8
	Springboro Community	<b>96.4</b>	<b>103.3</b>	23.6
	Kings	<b>92.8</b>	<b>103.7</b>	22.9
	Little Miami Local School District	<b>98.6</b>	<b>100.6</b>	22
	Mason	<b>97.4</b>	<b>108.3</b>	23.7
	Wayne	<b>98.3</b>	<b>102.8</b>	21.4
<b>Sig Counties Avg</b>		<b>92.6</b>	<b>94.8</b>	<b>21.1</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>93.6</b>	<b>95.6</b>	<b>21.2</b>

### 2006-2007, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Mean SAT Score 2005- 06</b>	<b>% Graduates Participating in SAT 2005- 06</b>	<b>% Graduates Graduating with Honors Diploma 2005-06</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	--	0	25.4
	Lima	970	1.4	8.2
	Bluffton	1185	6.2	35.1
	Allen East	1063	3.2	25.8
	Bath	1194	6	14.3
	Elida	1134	4.4	24
	Perry	1110	3.5	12.3
	Shawnee	1126	16.1	14.6
	Spencerville	1440	1.2	14.8
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe	974.6	13.8	36.2
	Middletown	1048	10.8	21.1
	Hamilton	1020	24.2	7.9
	Edgewood City School District	1118	5.3	24.5
	Fairfield	1090	33.1	26.6
	Lakota	1106	56	28
	Madison	1056	4.1	19
	New Miami	1060	2	0
	Ross	1019	40.8	17.4

<b>Clark</b>	Talawanda	1122	28.9	24.3
	Springfield	987.5	23.4	15.2
	Greenon Local	1058	10.3	21.3
	Tecumseh	1087	10.3	13
	Northeastern	1074	7.8	16
	Northwestern	1065	11.5	18.9
	Southeastern	1136	7.9	15.9
<b>Madison</b>	Clark-Shawnee	1068	28.9	33.5
	London	1013	28.8	13.6
	Jefferson	1073	8.7	28.3
	Jonathan Alder	1118	10.4	25.9
<b>Marion</b>	Madison-Plains	1015	5	18.5
	Marion	1097	3.8	0
	Elgin	1013	3.3	0
	Pleasant	1006	8	0
	Ridgedale Local Schools	907.5	5.7	30
<b>Richland</b>	River Valley	1090	1	0
	Mansfield	993.6	4.8	12.6
	Shelby	1030	0.6	25
	Clear Fork Valley	1207	4.3	29.7
	Crestview Local School District	1087	3.3	12.9
	Lexington	1227	7.7	27.7
	Lucas Local School District	1360	2	0
	Madison	1145	0.9	11.6
	Plymouth-Shiloh	1197	3.1	13.5
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario	1198	4.3	19.4
	New Boston	1000	9.4	53.1
	Portsmouth	1053	4	13
	Bloom-Vernon Local School District	990	6.3	28.6
	Clay	1030	2.9	14.3
	Green	1040	1.5	20.9
	Minford	990	4.1	9.1
	Northwest	966.7	2.4	12.2
	Valley Local School District	1135	2	22.5
	Washington-Nile	1260	0.9	15
<b>Seneca</b>	Wheelersburg	1042	4.8	22.1
	Tiffin	1146	6.9	18.1
	Fostoria	1103	2.3	6.2
	Seneca East	930	2.6	26
	Bettsville	1170	3.6	0
	Hopewell-Loudon	1020	1.5	32.3

Tuscarawas	New Riegel	840	3.1	15.6
	Old Fort	1025	7.5	17
	Claymont	905	1.2	14.6
	Newcomerstown	1130	1.2	9.9
	Dover	1125	7.4	21.3
	New Philadelphia	1098	4.8	21.2
	Garaway	1083	4.8	16.9
	Indian Valley	1193	3.4	12.8
	Strasburg-Franklin	1050	5.7	18.9
	Tuscarawas Valley	1118	7.2	16.2
Warren				
	Lebanon	1109	14.4	0.3
	Franklin	1037	1.9	18.6
	Carlisle	1000	4.2	11.9
	Springboro Community	1091	49.3	0
	Kings	1115	33.6	31.6
	Little Miami Local School District	1085	17.8	27.4
	Mason	1131	56.9	35.4
	Wayne	1012	21.6	29
Sig Counties Avg		<b>1080.4</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>18.1</b>
State Average		<b>1076.4</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>18.4</b>

## 2007-2008

County	District Name	Number of standards met (out of 30)	Read 4th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Read 8th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Math 8th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	26	<b>95.3</b>	<b>91.8</b>	82.3	69.6
	Lima City	3	<b>73.6</b>	<b>66.4</b>	56.9	43.6
	Bluffton Exempted Village	30	<b>93.5</b>	<b>92.2</b>	88	90.7
	Allen East Local	23	<b>81.8</b>	<b>78.4</b>	77.9	76.6
	Bath Local	27	<b>80.1</b>	<b>75.3</b>	87.3	77.3
	Elida Local	23	<b>79.1</b>	<b>71.2</b>	91.6	89.8
	Perry Local	12	<b>75.9</b>	<b>72.2</b>	68.5	66.7
	Shawnee Local	28	<b>83.8</b>	<b>68.7</b>	91.8	79.9
	Spencerville Local	28	<b>87</b>	<b>83.3</b>	83.5	84.8
Butler	Hamilton City	19	<b>84.1</b>	<b>75</b>	75.4	61.8

Clark	Middletown City	5	65.3	51.3	69.2	48.7
	Monroe Local	25	88.5	81.4	87.3	66
	Edgewood City	28	89.7	79.8	80.6	77.7
	Fairfield City	27	91.3	87.3	88.1	84.9
	Lakota Local	30	92.1	84.9	93.6	88.7
	Madison Local	23	84.8	79.5	84.1	87.9
	New Miami Local	21	79.6	75.9	60.4	62.3
	Ross Local	28	90.5	86.3	90.1	87.3
	Talawanda City	28	92.5	79.7	92.5	90.3
	Springfield City	3	65.3	61.6	58	59.4
	Greenon Local	22	83.2	73.3	79.4	89.4
	Tecumseh Local	22	82.7	72.3	76.4	79.4
	Northeastern Local	23	86.4	77.6	88.9	78.4
	Northwestern Local	24	81	69.7	88.8	82.2
	Southeastern Local	26	91.8	80.3	89.4	84.8
	Clark-Shawnee Local	25	87.2	82.4	88.3	90.1
Madison	London City	15	81.1	72.3	75	65.2
	Jefferson Local	20	90.5	84.5	90.9	75
	Jonathan Alder Local	29	89.6	88.8	93.9	87.1
	Madison-Plains Local	18	75.5	69.4	80	80.2
Marion	Marion City	1	65.6	54.9	58.1	60.1
	Elgin Local	16	86.8	84	80.2	82.9
	Pleasant Local	23	85	78.5	90.2	74.3
	Ridgedale Local	12	92.5	71.7	68.5	58.2
	River Valley Local	23	84.8	81.2	87.4	82.2
Richland	Shelby City	24	93	74.8	89.6	84.1
	Mansfield City	6	57.7	40.1	48.6	32.8
	Clear Fork Valley Local	25	86.7	89.1	87.4	78.5
	Crestview Local	26	97.6	95.2	88.3	90.4
	Lexington Local	28	93.3	89.9	90.6	86.3
	Lucas Local	24	83.7	83.7	82.1	87.2
	Madison Local	12	78	72.5	74.1	67.6
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	22	87.7	75.4	79.4	70.6
	Ontario Local	27	90.1	77.3	86.1	81
Scioto	New Boston Local	9	95.5	81.8	66.7	50
	Portsmouth City	3	60.6	52.7	71.7	66.4
	Bloom-Vernon Local	26	93	84.2	80.4	85.7
	Clay Local	20	86	64	85.3	76.5
	Green Local	18	78.6	96.4	64.6	66.7
	Minford Local	21	90	83.5	88.5	85.1
	Northwest Local	14	79.2	84.2	81.3	91.7
	Valley Local	21	86.5	85.4	84.1	95.5
	Washington-Nile Local	20	87.1	88.8	81	69

Seneca	Wheelersburg Local	28	90.4	78.4	91.6	85.5
	Tiffin City	27	89.9	89.9	86.7	79.6
	Fostoria City	8	67.7	61.6	68.1	53.5
	Seneca East Local	23	81.7	80.5	82.6	79.8
	Bettsville Local	19	61.9	52.4	95.2	76.2
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	26	82	78	84.6	80.8
	New Riegel Local	27	76.9	65.4	84.2	89.5
Tuscarawas	Old Fort Local	28	96.6	96.6	94.9	89.7
	Claymont City	23	88.8	86.3	75.2	70.9
	New Philadelphia City	24	93.1	86.6	92.1	87
	Dover City	28	90.1	85.1	89.5	82.9
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	23	85.5	81.6	74.4	79.1
	Garaway Local	28	97.9	92.6	91.5	87.8
	Indian Valley Local	26	84.5	84.5	92.8	81.7
Warren	Strasburg-Franklin Local	25	86.2	74.1	93.6	83
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	23	92.6	94.3	82.8	72.7
	Franklin City	22	83.5	68.9	83.3	73.4
	Lebanon City	29	89.8	87.6	92.1	90.3
	Carlisle Local	23	90.3	84.8	88.1	80.6
	Springboro Community City	29	94.9	91.1	91.2	86.9
	Kings Local	29	97.1	95.2	92	89.3
Significant Counties Average	Little Miami Local	26	90.6	88.6	86.1	82.6
	Mason City	30	94.4	94.3	96.9	95.1
	Wayne Local	30	92	94	95.3	85.9
	State Average	21.9	85.2	79.1	82.8	77.8
		22.6	85.5	79.5	83.4	78.3

## 2007-2008, cont.

County	District Name	Science 8th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Read OGT 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Write OGT 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Science OGT 2007-08 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	67.1	89.7	91	91	78.2
	Lima City	37.2	67.2	53.8	67.5	46.7
	Bluffton Exempted Village	84	97.8	94.5	96.7	94.5
	Allen East Local	57.1	87.8	84.1	89	76.8



Butler	Bath Local	71.3	92.8	86.3	89.5	81.7
	Elida Local	81.3	87.7	88.8	89.4	73.9
	Perry Local	55.6	76.6	73.4	75	71.9
	Shawnee Local	76.8	89.1	86.5	88.6	82.9
	Spencerville Local	70.9	92.6	86.4	91.4	80.2
	Hamilton City	45.3	84.9	82.9	85.7	72.5
	Middletown City	42.9	75.9	67.3	79.3	60.7
	Monroe Local	62.7	93.7	89.7	92.5	82.8
	Edgewood City	62.5	89.1	83.6	89.1	79.6
Clark	Fairfield City	74.3	90.3	85.7	89.5	78.6
	Lakota Local	82.2	93.6	89.4	94.1	86.5
	Madison Local	71	89	86.4	84.7	75.2
	New Miami Local	32.1	85.1	92.5	92.5	71.6
	Ross Local	78.9	88.2	90.3	91.1	82.6
	Talawanda City	79.7	89.7	83.8	90	78.8
	Springfield City	35.6	72	59.8	74.6	54.9
	Greenon Local	69.4	86.9	87.5	85.6	84.4
	Tecumseh Local	61.8	85.2	80.4	88.8	77.7
Madison	Northeastern Local	70.9	89.2	80.1	90.9	75.1
	Northwestern Local	72.9	90.2	83	93.5	77.8
	Southeastern Local	84.8	89.7	86.2	91.4	87.9
	Clark-Shawnee Local	78.8	89	85.4	87.9	80.7
	London City	54	84.4	80.3	87.3	72.5
	Jefferson Local	56.8	90.4	82.6	87.8	79.1
	Jonathan Alder Local	87	92.5	92.5	90.2	83.5
	Madison-Plains Local	67.5	89.7	87.9	92.2	79.3
Marion	Marion City	36	72.2	71.9	71.6	62.8
	Elgin Local	63.1	78.5	70.2	78.3	63.3
	Pleasant Local	69.9	87.6	84.8	91.4	80
	Ridgedale Local	45.5	84.1	77.8	76.2	68.3
	River Valley Local	62.2	90.6	85.9	89	77.7
Richland	Shelby City	70.3	89.3	90.4	76.3	78.5
	Mansfield City	26.2	81.3	75.2	80.7	58.9
	Clear Fork Valley Local	74.1	91.7	85.4	91.7	78.5
	Crestview Local	76.6	92.6	89.6	93.6	84.2
	Lexington Local	78.9	95.6	93.4	94.3	85.6
	Lucas Local	79.5	91.5	87.2	93.6	78.7
	Madison Local	58.6	81.3	73.8	85.5	65
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	58.8	83.8	77.9	83.6	75
	Ontario Local	73	95.8	95.8	96.6	90.8
Scioto	New Boston Local	58.3	73.9	65.2	69.6	60.9
	Portsmouth City	48.6	66.7	53.8	65.7	49.1

Seneca	Bloom-Vernon Local	64.3	83.1	89.6	84.4	76.6
	Clay Local	67.6	92.9	85.7	92.9	88.1
	Green Local	47.9	87	83.3	77.8	70.4
	Minford Local	72.4	83.7	75.7	78.6	67
	Northwest Local	55.2	81.2	70.7	73.7	60.2
	Valley Local	75	84.5	89.3	86.4	85.4
	Washington-Nile Local	65	86.7	79.2	84.2	70.8
	Wheelersburg Local	80.7	93.8	85.6	97.9	85.6
	Tiffin City	72.8	86	80.3	87.3	75.3
Tuscarawas	Fostoria City	45.1	73.4	69.3	70.3	63.8
	Seneca East Local	72.4	92.2	83.5	89.3	86.4
	Bettsville Local	66.7	76.5	94.1	82.4	76.5
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	71.8	88.6	95.7	87.1	87.1
	New Riegel Local	81.6	89.2	97.3	91.9	91.9
	Old Fort Local	87.2	85	82.5	90	87.5
	Claymont City	57	81.2	81.9	85.2	74.8
	New Philadelphia City	82.7	88.1	82.2	90.5	80.2
	Dover City	77.9	96.1	92.7	91.7	88.3
Warren	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	51.2	84.6	91.3	88	75
	Garaway Local	81.7	98.9	92.6	95.7	95.7
	Indian Valley Local	82.4	91	84.8	93.1	84.8
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	80.9	84.5	77.6	84.5	75.9
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	67.2	96.7	91	96.7	86.9
	Franklin City	67.5	82.6	77.1	81.4	71.6
	Lebanon City	77.2	91.1	87.4	88.9	79.7
	Carlisle Local	73.1	88.8	76.1	88.7	76.5
	Springboro Community City	79.7	96.7	95.5	97.3	92.3
Significant Counties Average	Kings Local	80.1	94	91.9	94.4	88.1
	Little Miami Local	74	85.4	88.6	89.5	82.5
State Average	Mason City	90.3	97.3	95.1	96.2	93.8
	Wayne Local	84.5	91.4	87.9	93.1	81
		<b>67.3</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>77.5</b>
		<b>68.1</b>	<b>88.3</b>	<b>83.8</b>	<b>88.2</b>	<b>78.6</b>

### 2007-2008, cont.

County	District Name	Read 11th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Math 11th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Write 11th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Social Studies 11th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient	Science 11th grade 2007-08 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	89	90.2	93.9	91.5	85.4
	Lima City	82.6	70.3	85.3	71.9	63.8

<b>Butler</b>	Bluffton Exempted Village	98.9	98.9	100	97.7	98.9
	Allen East Local	98	95.9	96.9	94.9	91.8
	Bath Local	97.1	95.7	96.4	94.2	92.8
	Elida Local	96.4	93.9	98.5	90.8	90.8
	Perry Local	78.9	78.9	89.5	75.4	71.9
	Shawnee Local	92.3	89.4	94.7	90.2	89.4
	Spencerville Local	96.6	94.3	95.4	89.7	93.1
	Hamilton City	93.6	92.8	94	89.4	85.7
	Middletown City	91.5	82.3	92	83.2	82.9
	Monroe Local	97.1	94.2	97.1	91.2	85.4
	Edgewood City	94.8	92.2	95.6	91.1	93.3
	Fairfield City	95.3	93.5	96.1	91.2	88.1
	Lakota Local	97	95.3	97.7	95.5	94.4
	Madison Local	93.2	94.9	94	88	87.2
	New Miami Local	95.7	94.3	100	90	91.4
	Ross Local	98.1	98.6	99	93.8	94.3
	Talawanda City	98.1	95.4	98.1	96.2	95.8
	Springfield City	88	83.9	88.8	77.9	72.4
	Greenon Local	95.8	97.6	98.2	92.7	93.9
	Tecumseh Local	92.6	88.5	92.6	87.7	87.2
	Northeastern Local	93.7	92.2	94.6	87.5	89
	Northwestern Local	93.6	94.3	94.3	92.1	90.1
	Southeastern Local	98.4	98.4	100	98.4	96.9
	Clark-Shawnee Local	94.4	91.9	94.4	90.4	88.4
<b>Madison</b>	London City	88.6	85.7	93.6	86.4	83.6
	Jefferson Local	95.3	92.9	97.6	89.4	89.4
	Jonathan Alder Local	94.8	94.8	94.9	92.3	90.4
	Madison-Plains Local	96.7	96.7	98.9	92.3	89
<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	84.4	83.2	84.4	79.1	76.5
	Elgin Local	87.6	87.6	90.7	76.7	79.1
	Pleasant Local	96.9	96.9	95.3	94.5	95.3
	Ridgedale Local	90.7	85.3	90.7	72	78.7
	River Valley Local	95.5	95.6	96.3	91	90.3
<b>Richland</b>	Shelby City	95.4	94.3	96.9	89.7	89.2
	Mansfield City	86.7	80.7	86.3	78.3	71.1
	Clear Fork Valley Local	96.5	91.5	95.1	92.3	90.1
	Crestview Local	97.9	95.8	96.9	92.7	93.8
	Lexington Local	96.2	96.2	95.7	95.7	93.8
	Lucas Local	95.7	93.5	93.5	84.8	84.8
	Madison Local	92	89.8	92	87.9	84.7
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	93.3	88	97.3	82.7	88
	Ontario Local	99.3	96.5	98.6	96.5	97.2

<b>Scioto</b>	New Boston Local	88.5	84.6	96.2	84.6	80.8
	Portsmouth City	82.5	80.2	91.3	80.2	71.3
	Bloom-Vernon Local	94	98.5	92.5	94	91
	Clay Local	91.1	87.5	92.9	87.5	78.6
	Green Local	88.6	86.4	86.4	88.6	84.1
	Minford Local	91.7	88.3	94.2	85.8	85
	Northwest Local	83.5	86.8	85.1	83.5	79.3
	Valley Local	91.3	93.5	92.4	90.2	91.3
	Washington-Nile Local	91.3	89.3	92.2	91.3	86.4
	Wheelersburg Local	95.7	94.8	96.5	91.3	87.8
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	97.1	96.6	97.6	96.1	96.1
	Fostoria City	90.8	85	90	85.8	82.5
	Seneca East Local	94.7	93.6	96.8	89.4	91.5
	Bettsville Local	100	100	92.9	100	92.9
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	98.6	97.1	100	100	92.8
	New Riegel Local	94.4	100	100	97.2	100
	Old Fort Local	97.6	100	100	100	100
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	87.3	86.7	90.2	82.7	79.8
	New Philadelphia City	93.8	91.9	94.6	84.6	84.6
	Dover City	97.7	95.3	98.8	96.5	92.4
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	95.3	96.9	92.2	90.6	93.8
	Garaway Local	97.8	92.3	98.9	92.3	90.1
	Indian Valley Local	94	88.9	97.4	88	88
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	98	98	93.9	95.9	93.9
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	97.4	97.4	97.4	94	95.7
<b>Warren</b>	Franklin City	93.3	90.4	93.3	89.9	87.1
	Lebanon City	95.6	91.8	95.1	93	90.2
	Carlisle Local	94.8	92.5	94.8	90.3	86.7
	Springboro Community City	99.7	97.9	99.7	97.6	97.6
	Kings Local	96.6	95.9	97.4	94.8	95.9
	Little Miami Local	95.1	94.7	98.2	93	91.5
	Mason City	98.2	97.9	98.2	97.6	97
	Wayne Local	94.8	99.1	98.3	97.4	92.2
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>93.8</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>90.0</b>	<b>88.4</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>94.2</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>95.1</b>	<b>90.5</b>	<b>88.9</b>

### 2007-2008, cont.

County	District Name	Final graduation rate 2006-07	Performance Index Score 2007-08	Mean ACT Score 2006-07	% Graduates Participating in ACT 2006-07
Allen	Delphos City	91.6	99.7	21	68.4

<b>Butler</b>	Lima City	66.4	77.5	18	48.4
	Bluffton Exempted Village	97.8	104.6	22	73
	Allen East Local	98.5	94.8	20	65.7
	Bath Local	96.4	96.8	22	62.9
	Elida Local	94.2	96.3	21	63.4
	Perry Local	91.5	88.8	19	42.6
	Shawnee Local	99	100.2	24	69.1
	Spencerville Local	92	98.2	21	65
	Hamilton City	77.5	92	20	43.2
	Middletown City	78.2	80	20	51.3
	Monroe Local	91.4	98	21	57
	Edgewood City	90.8	97.5	21	57
	Fairfield City	96.1	99.4	22	65.9
	Lakota Local	95.5	102.9	23	72.9
	Madison Local	95.4	94	21	53.4
	New Miami Local	94.4	93.5	19	23.5
	Ross Local	92.8	100.8	21	54.2
	Talawanda City	97.6	99.2	22	65.6
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield City	85.3	78.4	19	39.8
	Greenon Local	94.2	96.7	23	58.8
	Tecumseh Local	88.2	93.6	21	46.9
	Northeastern Local	95.4	94.8	21	63.4
	Northwestern Local	95.1	95.2	22	62.5
	Southeastern Local	94.3	98.4	22	56.1
	Clark-Shawnee Local	91.4	98	23	60.1
<b>Madison</b>	London City	94.4	88.5	22	47.5
	Jefferson Local	95.5	93.3	20	61.2
	Jonathan Alder Local	96.2	102	22	57.9
	Madison-Plains Local	95.8	93.2	20	60
<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	74.1	80.6	21	50.5
	Elgin Local	82.1	89.3	22	59.4
	Pleasant Local	96.5	95.2	22	71.2
	Ridgedale Local	93.9	87.8	20	59.7
	River Valley Local	93.5	93.8	22	60
<b>Richland</b>	Shelby City	91.9	96.6	21	62
	Mansfield City	89.1	74.4	20	53.6
	Clear Fork Valley Local	95.8	97.7	21	64.5
	Crestview Local	93.5	99.2	22	44.8
	Lexington Local	98.3	101.7	23	71.4
	Lucas Local	95.3	95	22	63.4
	Madison Local	90.4	87.1	20	47.5
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	91.7	94	21	33.3
	Ontario Local	98.7	99.2	22	75.5

Scioto					
	New Boston Local	100	87.1	19	72.2
	Portsmouth City	93.8	80.2	20	44.8
	Bloom-Vernon Local	90.5	97.7	21	57.9
	Clay Local	100	92.2	20	60.5
	Green Local	93.5	90.3	20	48.8
	Minford Local	98.9	94.1	21	59.6
	Northwest Local	93.8	89.9	20	40
	Valley Local	96.4	94	20	81.5
	Washington-Nile Local	96.8	91.7	20	48.9
	Wheelersburg Local	99	100	21	77.8
Seneca					
	Tiffin City	87.7	98.1	22	65.4
	Fostoria City	68.8	83.5	20	57.5
	Seneca East Local	100	95.9	21	74.4
	Bettsville Local	100	89.3	21	27.3
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	100	97.9	21	71.2
	New Riegel Local	94.9	100.2	21	78.4
	Old Fort Local	100	100.2	20	52.4
Tuscarawas					
	Claymont City	95	94.8	20	61.2
	New Philadelphia City	86	98.1	22	55.4
	Dover City	96.3	100.1	22	70.9
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	92.1	94.6	21	46.3
	Garaway Local	90.2	102.2	22	89.1
	Indian Valley Local	97.9	98.5	20	48.9
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	100	96.3	22	57.6
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	98.7	98.1	22	84.2
Warren	Franklin City	90.8	93.9	20	55.4
	Lebanon City	93.2	100.9	22	67.5
	Carlisle Local	91.4	93.5	20	55.7
	Springboro Community City	97.2	104	23	81.6
	Kings Local	95.9	105	24	78.3
	Little Miami Local	97.8	99.7	22	65.5
	Mason City	97.1	108.8	24	78
	Wayne Local	100	103.4	22	65.5
	Significant Counties Average	93.3	95.0	21.1	59.9
State Average	94.2	95.8	21.3	60.2	

### 2007-2008, cont.

County	District Name	Mean SAT Score 2006- 07	% Graduates Participating in SAT 2006- 07	% Graduates Graduating with Honors Diploma 2006-07
--------	---------------	-------------------------------	--	---

<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	1400	1.3	31.6
	Lima City	952	2.3	12.7
	Bluffton Exempted Village	1294	3.4	19.1
	Allen East Local	1130	1.5	16.4
	Bath Local	1216	4.5	0
	Elida Local	1076	2.6	23.2
	Perry Local	750	1.9	7.4
	Shawnee Local	1204	18.8	22.2
	Spencerville Local	1006	5	5
<b>Butler</b>	Hamilton City	1024	17.3	7.4
	Middletown City	1072	7	18.8
	Monroe Local	1002	13.3	25
	Edgewood City	988	7.6	18.6
	Fairfield City	1078	31.7	27
	Lakota Local	1094	55.9	28.7
	Madison Local	950	1	25.2
	New Miami Local	0	0	0
	Ross Local	996	34.9	11.5
	Talawanda City	1076	24.9	22.3
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield City	1022	19.8	13.8
	Greenon Local	1090	13.7	32.8
	Tecumseh Local	1088	9.8	11.6
	Northeastern Local	978	4.8	17.1
	Northwestern Local	1030	11.8	21.3
	Southeastern Local	1108	12.1	18.2
	Clark-Shawnee Local	1050	29.1	31.8
<b>Madison</b>	London City	1012	40.7	22.4
	Jefferson Local	1000	3.5	18.8
	Jonathan Alder Local	1098	11.2	25
	Madison-Plains Local	1112	7	19.1
<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	986	5	11.1
	Elgin Local	1196	4.2	0
	Pleasant Local	1204	8.1	0
	Ridgedale Local	984	4.8	12.9
	River Valley Local	1160	7.7	22.3
<b>Richland</b>	Shelby City	1078	2.5	32.9
	Mansfield City	1132	2	12.2
	Clear Fork Valley Local	1098	5.8	22.3
	Crestview Local	1080	1.1	19.5
	Lexington Local	1216	11.7	24.7
	Lucas Local	1220	2.4	16.3
	Madison Local	964	1.4	14.3
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	1040	1.5	13.2

<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario Local	1224	8.6	26.5
	New Boston Local	910	5.6	44.4
	Portsmouth City	0	0	15.2
	Bloom-Vernon Local	960	1.8	22.8
	Clay Local	1100	2.6	26.3
	Green Local	930	2.3	11.6
	Minford Local	1050	1.1	13.8
	Northwest Local	0	0	10.5
	Valley Local	0	0	29.6
	Washington-Nile Local	0	0	6.5
	Wheelersburg Local	1106	2	24.2
<b>Seneca</b>				
	Tiffin City	1154	8.6	21.4
	Fostoria City	1200	2.8	14.2
	Seneca East Local	1146	4.9	0
	Bettsville Local	1044	13.6	18.2
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	0	0	28.8
	New Riegel Local	1190	8.1	24.3
	Old Fort Local	926	7.1	11.9
<b>Tuscarawas</b>				
	Claymont City	980	1.3	13.5
	New Philadelphia City	1104	8.6	19.7
	Dover City	1202	6.8	18
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	0	0	8.5
	Garaway Local	1156	5.5	23.6
	Indian Valley Local	1048	4.3	9.4
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	980	5.1	15.3
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	1182	6.6	14.5
<b>Warren</b>				
	Franklin City	972	6.8	25.4
	Lebanon City	1116	16.7	22.9
	Carlisle Local	1006	5.7	10.4
	Springboro Community City	1090	33.9	30.4
	Kings Local	1134	35.3	33.6
	Little Miami Local	1064	16.4	27.4
	Mason City	1118	53.8	35.3
	Wayne Local	1064	12.6	30.3
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>979.4</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>18.8</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>977.7</b>	<b>13.3</b>	<b>18.5</b>

**2008-2009**



County	District Name	Number of standards met (out of 30)	Read 4th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient	Math 4th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient	Read 8th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	29	92.6	92.6	80.3
	Lima City	4	71	72.2	49.4
	Bluffton Exempted Village	30	90.7	94.2	90.1
	Allen East Local	23	86.2	82.8	88.3
	Bath Local	25	86	82.2	85.7
	Elida Local	25	89	86.8	84.3
	Perry Local	13	82.6	81.2	73.2
	Shawnee Local	27	94.3	86	86.4
	Spencerville Local	29	84.7	87.1	77.3
Butler	Monroe Local	25	91.3	89.1	76.3
	Hamilton City	16	82.8	72.5	64.2
	Middletown City	5	72.2	63.4	57.5
	Edgewood City	25	90.3	84.1	77.3
	Fairfield City	26	86.8	84.4	79
	Lakota Local	29	89.9	87.9	87.9
	Madison Local	22	88.9	86.3	78.7
	New Miami Local	15	75	73.5	52.5
	Ross Local	28	92.9	94.8	85.9
	Talawanda City	27	91.4	88.2	86.3
Clark	Springfield City	4	60.8	54.4	56.3
	Greenon Local	24	89.6	84.7	79
	Tecumseh Local	25	83.7	76	69.9
	Northeastern Local	26	85.3	79.8	80.1
	Northwestern Local	23	84.6	77.2	79.5
	Southeastern Local	28	92.3	92.3	87.1
	Clark-Shawnee Local	26	86.4	83.3	82.3
Madison	London City	14	73.9	69	67.1
	Jefferson Local	19	82.1	77.9	65.2
	Jonathan Alder Local	29	85.6	86.9	86
	Madison-Plains Local	24	86.5	80.9	79.5
Marion	Marion City	0	64.1	71.3	55.7
	Elgin Local	14	84.4	82.3	68.1
	Pleasant Local	24	85.9	88.5	68.7
	Ridgedale Local	13	92.8	84.1	58.9
	River Valley Local	22	84.4	91.6	77.5
Richland	Mansfield City	7	62	50	43.1
	Shelby City	24	93.4	83.1	75.1

<b>Scioto</b>	Clear Fork Valley Local	25	93.5	90.6	76.5
	Crestview Local	26	93.8	88.9	77.9
	Lexington Local	27	94.4	88.3	81.7
	Lucas Local	25	87.2	82.6	93.1
	Madison Local	17	84.8	77.8	59.6
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	24	87	87	79.2
	Ontario Local	26	94.4	86.7	81.3
	New Boston Local	9	70	56.7	77.3
	Portsmouth City	4	65.5	57.3	67.9
	Bloom-Vernon Local	27	91.5	96.3	79.5
	Clay Local	19	76.3	78.9	73
	Green Local	12	82.2	77.8	76.2
	Minford Local	21	78	75.6	79.2
	Northwest Local	17	80.6	76	73.4
	Valley Local	23	81.7	74.4	79.7
	Washington-Nile Local	20	87.4	82.9	71.4
	Wheelersburg Local	28	90.7	79.7	78.8
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	24	91.4	90.9	70.8
	Fostoria City	11	68.2	78.1	63
	Seneca East Local	24	88.5	86.9	77.8
	Bettsville Local	15	--	--	66.7
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	24	82.5	82.5	68.5
	New Riegel Local	25	97	90.9	92.3
	Old Fort Local	27	82.8	89.7	84.8
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	22	88	86.7	67.7
	Dover City	28	89.2	81.7	84.5
	New Philadelphia City	26	86.2	80.1	86.4
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	18	80.5	75.6	74.2
	Garaway Local	29	95.8	87.4	88.9
	Indian Valley Local	26	87.2	88.7	77
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	24	83	76.6	82
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	26	90.2	92.6	68.4
<b>Warren</b>	Franklin City	22	88.6	81	75.7
	Lebanon City	29	91.6	90.6	85.3
	Carlisle Local	25	83.7	85.2	75.4
	Springboro Community City	30	95.1	92.7	89
	Kings Local	29	96	95.3	85
	Little Miami Local	27	92	91.1	86.3
	Mason City	30	96.4	95.8	93.1
	Wayne Local	30	94.4	94.4	95.5
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>21.9</b>	<b>85.6</b>	<b>82.6</b>	<b>76.4</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>23.1</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>83.7</b>	<b>76.5</b>

## 2008-2009, cont.

County	District Name	Math 8th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient	Science 8th grade 2008- 09 % at or above proficient	Read OGT 2008-09 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2008-09 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	78.9	85.9	95.3	91.8
	Lima City	40.1	36.3	74.2	64.3
	Bluffton Exempted Village	95.1	87.7	95.5	92.1
	Allen East Local	82.1	80.2	90.7	86.7
	Bath Local	81.2	78.6	91.9	90.1
	Elida Local	82.7	83.2	89.8	89.8
	Perry Local	62.5	51.8	83.9	74.2
	Shawnee Local	84.5	81.6	95.1	94.6
	Spencerville Local	89.3	77.3	83.6	94
Butler	Monroe Local	71.1	65.1	90.6	90.6
	Hamilton City	59	48.5	83.2	83.2
	Middletown City	40	37.9	75.4	72.1
	Edgewood City	74.7	60.1	89.4	84.6
	Fairfield City	79.7	73.1	89.6	87
	Lakota Local	86.7	79.7	95.4	93.8
	Madison Local	82.7	70.9	83.2	84.6
	New Miami Local	60.7	37.7	80	81.8
	Ross Local	89.3	80.6	91.4	92.2
	Talawanda City	84.1	77.3	88.1	86.8
Clark	Springfield City	60.9	37.8	69.3	59.3
	Greenon Local	93.4	70.1	89.9	85.5
	Tecumseh Local	78.9	51.8	84.8	80.2
	Northeastern Local	77.4	69.5	87.5	84.2
	Northwestern Local	78.7	73	93.2	91.8
	Southeastern Local	78.3	80	95.7	94.3
	Clark-Shawnee Local	89	75.1	87.9	87
Madison	London City	60	47.3	85.6	82
	Jefferson Local	63	53.3	90	88
	Jonathan Alder Local	81.7	84	96.8	90.4
	Madison-Plains Local	75	69.6	88.9	82.9
Marion	Marion City	56	41.9	66.1	66.9
	Elgin Local	60.3	57.4	79.9	74.6
	Pleasant Local	66.4	64.3	91.4	87.6
	Ridgedale Local	56.9	50	75.3	65.4
	River Valley Local	66.9	63.4	86.3	84.2

Richland					
	Mansfield City	30.4	24.6	75.9	73
	Shelby City	81	65.1	88.1	86.3
	Clear Fork Valley Local	69.8	78.5	84.7	84.7
	Crestview Local	74.7	68.4	91.5	86.8
	Lexington Local	84.8	74.4	91.3	90
	Lucas Local	80	89.7	97.9	89.6
	Madison Local	64.9	55.3	82.1	84.2
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	72.2	87.5	86.8	78
	Ontario Local	77.1	76.4	94.1	91.5
Scioto	New Boston Local	59.1	59.1	69.6	73.9
	Portsmouth City	65.1	45.3	77.9	77.8
	Bloom-Vernon Local	88.5	82.1	91	94
	Clay Local	59.5	54.1	89.2	78.4
	Green Local	64.3	71.4	72.1	74.4
	Minford Local	69.3	61.4	89.3	81
	Northwest Local	71.6	56	86.4	81.6
	Valley Local	91.3	78.3	90.5	89.3
	Washington-Nile Local	58	73.2	84.5	81.8
	Wheelersburg Local	79.7	72	87.7	88.7
Seneca	Tiffin City	71.7	67.9	87.7	85.8
	Fostoria City	65.8	47.1	75.5	74.8
	Seneca East Local	71.6	71.3	97.8	94.6
	Bettsville Local	75	66.7	82.4	88.2
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	83.6	69.9	95.7	97.1
	New Riegel Local	80.8	73.1	100	100
	Old Fort Local	81.8	72.7	90.2	92.7
Tuscarawas	Claymont City	73.9	70.8	80	87.1
	Dover City	91.7	84	93.3	93.9
	New Philadelphia City	77.7	73.6	87.3	85.2
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	73.2	59.8	85.2	92.6
	Garaway Local	84.8	83.8	98	93.9
	Indian Valley Local	69.6	77.6	86	86
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	86.9	78.7	87.1	91.9
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	65.4	67.7	91.3	92
Warren	Franklin City	69.3	61.5	82	77.4
	Lebanon City	88.1	77.5	95.1	93.5
	Carlisle Local	77.1	77.1	83.5	81.2
	Springboro Community City	91	86.1	96.9	94.9
	Kings Local	88.4	83	92.4	91.3
	Little Miami Local	86.9	85.3	90.9	90.5
	Mason City	95.8	92.2	96.5	96
	Wayne Local	93.1	91.7	94.8	95.7

Significant Counties Average  
State Average

74.7	68.5	87.5	85.7
75.8	68.8	88.0	86.3

## 2008-2009, cont.

County	District Name	Science OGT 2008- 09 % at or above proficient	Read 11th grade 2008- 09 % at or above proficient	Math 11th grade 2008- 09 % at or above proficient	Write 11th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient
Allen	Delphos City	92.9	95.3	95.3	95.3
	Lima City	62.3	84.6	67.9	87
	Bluffton Exempted Village	94.4	97.9	99	99
	Allen East Local	84	94.9	89.7	93.6
	Bath Local	82.6	95.5	93.2	94.7
	Elida Local	81.3	93.9	92.8	93.9
	Perry Local	72.6	84.5	83.1	85.9
	Shawnee Local	92.6	94.5	92.5	93.5
	Spencerville Local	82.1	100	96.2	98.7
Butler	Monroe Local	81.7	98.8	98.8	100
	Hamilton City	71.2	96.2	94	96.5
	Middletown City	63.8	87.5	82.8	89.4
	Edgewood City	82.2	95.7	90.6	96.4
	Fairfield City	80.9	96.1	92.8	95.5
	Lakota Local	91.8	97.7	96.4	98
	Madison Local	76.7	94.5	94.5	95.3
	New Miami Local	74.5	93.8	93.8	92.3
	Ross Local	88.3	97.1	97.4	97.8
	Talawanda City	85.8	97	95.2	95.9
Clark	Springfield City	51.9	88.3	79.5	88.3
	Greenon Local	86.2	95.1	93.1	93.8
	Tecumseh Local	76.1	92.5	90.7	93.3
	Northeastern Local	82	94	92.3	95.3
	Northwestern Local	87.7	96.6	94	97.3
	Southeastern Local	84.3	96.4	94.6	94.6
	Clark-Shawnee Local	80.7	93	90.9	92.5
Madison	London City	74.8	94.7	92.1	96.5
	Jefferson Local	82	94.3	91.4	93.3
	Jonathan Alder Local	93	97.1	96.4	97.8
	Madison-Plains Local	80.3	95.5	93.7	95.5
Marion	Marion City	52.4	83.8	79.3	82.8
	Elgin Local	73.9	86.6	86.6	89.1
	Pleasant Local	83.8	94	96	96

<b>Richland</b>	Ridgedale Local	62	92.6	88.2	89.7
	River Valley Local	77.2	95.2	91.1	94.5
	Mansfield City	65.5	88.8	86.3	85.9
	Shelby City	77.8	94.3	93.7	92
	Clear Fork Valley Local	84.7	92.9	93	95.6
	Crestview Local	78.3	96.8	96.8	98.9
	Lexington Local	86.6	98	96.4	98
	Lucas Local	91.5	93.9	91.4	96.4
	Madison Local	73.9	92.1	87.4	92.1
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	73.6	95.2	90.5	96.8
	Ontario Local	86.3	98.2	98.2	98.2
<b>Scioto</b>					
	New Boston Local	65.2	88	76	88
	Portsmouth City	65.9	80.6	74.5	82.7
	Bloom-Vernon Local	85.1	93.2	93.2	95.9
	Clay Local	81.1	96.5	92.7	96.6
	Green Local	67.4	93.4	88.5	90.2
	Minford Local	77.7	92.4	91.5	93.9
	Northwest Local	76.8	92	90.3	90.2
	Valley Local	79.8	92.4	92.4	93.5
	Washington-Nile Local	75.5	91.2	90.4	93.6
	Wheelersburg Local	87.7	95	94	98
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	82	97.3	94.2	98.3
	Fostoria City	68.3	91.2	84.5	90.4
	Seneca East Local	91.4	93	89	95
	Bettsville Local	82.4	100	100	100
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	91.3	98.5	100	96.9
	New Riegel Local	97	100	100	100
	Old Fort Local	85.4	90.2	92.7	100
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	78.6	92.9	92.9	95.3
	Dover City	86	97.5	96.5	96.5
	New Philadelphia City	81.4	94.6	89.9	95.7
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	77.8	91.9	97.7	95.3
	Garaway Local	90.9	98.9	98.9	98.9
	Indian Valley Local	92.1	92.5	90.6	97.7
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	91.9	98.1	94.4	98.1
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	84.8	96.7	95	97.5
<b>Warren</b>	Franklin City	70.8	91.5	87.2	92.8
	Lebanon City	90.1	95	93.1	95.3
	Carlisle Local	76.6	93.7	88.2	93.7
	Springboro Community City	95.4	99.4	98.5	99.4
	Kings Local	87.5	97.5	95.4	96.8
	Little Miami Local	88.1	97	94.8	97.4

Mason City	94	98.8	97.7	98.5
Wayne Local	87.9	98.3	94	98.3
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>94.2</b>	<b>91.9</b>	<b>94.7</b>
<b>State Average</b>	<b>81.9</b>	<b>94.9</b>	<b>92.2</b>	<b>95.2</b>

## 2008-2009, cont.

County	District Name	Science 11th grade 2008-09 % at or above proficient	Final graduation rate 2007-08	Performance Index Score 2008-09	Mean ACT Score 2007-08
Allen	Delphos City	90.6	91.1	100.6	20
	Lima City	62.8	55.4	80.5	18
	Bluffton Exempted Village	95.9	98.9	105.4	23
	Allen East Local	80.8	94.7	97.3	20
	Bath Local	92.4	91	97.8	21
	Elida Local	87.8	92.8	97.4	22
	Perry Local	80.3	92.9	89.7	21
	Shawnee Local	89.9	96.1	101.6	23
	Spencerville Local	93.6	94.3	99.8	22
Butler	Monroe Local	96.9	95.2	98.8	21
	Hamilton City	88.3	84.7	89.9	21
	Middletown City	77.1	79.3	81.7	20
	Edgewood City	89.5	93.4	96.6	21
	Fairfield City	90.4	96.2	98.2	22
	Lakota Local	93.9	94.7	103.6	23
	Madison Local	92.2	94.2	94.9	22
	New Miami Local	93.8	94	87.3	18
	Ross Local	94.4	88.8	102.1	22
	Talawanda City	90	95.9	99.3	23
Clark	Springfield City	73.2	77	78.1	20
	Greenon Local	93.1	91.2	97.1	22
	Tecumseh Local	89.3	93.3	93.6	22
	Northeastern Local	88.6	96.9	96.3	22
	Northwestern Local	93.3	98.1	97.3	22
	Southeastern Local	92.9	100	98.9	21
	Clark-Shawnee Local	89.3	89.8	98.9	22
Madison	London City	86	95.1	87.4	21
	Jefferson Local	92.5	97.2	92.7	21
	Jonathan Alder Local	94.1	96.9	100.9	22
	Madison-Plains Local	90.1	94.1	95.3	21

<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	71.7	<b>69.5</b>	<b>80.4</b>	21
	Elgin Local	76.5	<b>88.3</b>	<b>90.2</b>	21
	Pleasant Local	89.9	<b>90.2</b>	<b>96.8</b>	23
	Ridgedale Local	79.4	<b>94</b>	<b>86.4</b>	20
	River Valley Local	86.9	<b>91.5</b>	<b>93.4</b>	22
<b>Richland</b>	Mansfield City	71.7	<b>81.7</b>	<b>76.1</b>	20
	Shelby City	89.7	<b>95.8</b>	<b>95.9</b>	22
	Clear Fork Valley Local	90.2	<b>97.3</b>	<b>97</b>	22
	Crestview Local	92.5	<b>88.6</b>	<b>99.3</b>	21
	Lexington Local	95.5	<b>99.2</b>	<b>100.8</b>	23
	Lucas Local	88.5	<b>97.9</b>	<b>96.7</b>	21
	Madison Local	80	<b>88.9</b>	<b>90.9</b>	21
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	92.1	<b>94.8</b>	<b>95.4</b>	20
	Ontario Local	98.2	<b>96.2</b>	<b>98.7</b>	22
<b>Scioto</b>	New Boston Local	80	<b>100</b>	<b>87.4</b>	19
	Portsmouth City	65.3	<b>88.9</b>	<b>82</b>	19
	Bloom-Vernon Local	86.5	<b>94.6</b>	<b>99.4</b>	21
	Clay Local	94.7	<b>100</b>	<b>90.4</b>	20
	Green Local	82	<b>90</b>	<b>90.1</b>	19
	Minford Local	90.1	<b>95.8</b>	<b>92.7</b>	21
	Northwest Local	85.4	<b>95.1</b>	<b>91.1</b>	19
	Valley Local	89.1	<b>97.8</b>	<b>94.5</b>	21
	Washington-Nile Local	84	<b>92.7</b>	<b>92.8</b>	20
	Wheelersburg Local	97	<b>100</b>	<b>99.4</b>	21
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	92.8	<b>90.7</b>	<b>98.3</b>	22
	Fostoria City	81.6	<b>72</b>	<b>87.4</b>	20
	Seneca East Local	91	<b>96.3</b>	<b>97.8</b>	20
	Bettsville Local	83.3	<b>88.2</b>	<b>88.1</b>	20
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	95.4	<b>100</b>	<b>97.9</b>	22
	New Riegel Local	100	<b>100</b>	<b>102.5</b>	22
	Old Fort Local	95.1	<b>97.9</b>	<b>101.3</b>	21
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	91	<b>90.4</b>	<b>94.8</b>	21
	Dover City	95	<b>95.9</b>	<b>100.4</b>	22
	New Philadelphia City	89.2	<b>83.9</b>	<b>97.9</b>	22
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	86	<b>87.6</b>	<b>93.1</b>	22
	Garaway Local	96.8	<b>97.8</b>	<b>103.6</b>	22
	Indian Valley Local	90.8	<b>98.3</b>	<b>97.1</b>	22
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	87	<b>96</b>	<b>94.4</b>	22
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	94.2	<b>97.1</b>	<b>99.2</b>	23
<b>Warren</b>	Franklin City	86.4	<b>87.4</b>	<b>94.4</b>	21
	Lebanon City	90.8	<b>98.1</b>	<b>101.6</b>	22
	Carlisle Local	87.4	<b>97.3</b>	<b>94.2</b>	21



Springboro Community City	97.6	<b>96.2</b>	<b>105</b>	24
Kings Local	94.3	<b>92.1</b>	<b>105.1</b>	23
Little Miami Local	94.4	<b>95.2</b>	<b>102.1</b>	22
Mason City	96.8	<b>98.2</b>	<b>108.9</b>	24
Wayne Local	93.1	<b>99.2</b>	<b>104.9</b>	21
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>	<b>88.7</b>	<b>92.7</b>	<b>95.4</b>	<b>21.3</b>
<b>State Average</b>	<b>89.4</b>	<b>93.9</b>	<b>96.4</b>	<b>21.3</b>

## 2008-2009, cont.

County	District Name	Mean SAT Score 2007-08	% Graduates Participating in SAT 2007- 08	% Graduates Graduating with Honors Diploma 2007-08
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	0	0	26
	Lima City	958	3.3	12.8
	Bluffton Exempted Village	1222	4.5	25.8
	Allen East Local	0	0	22.2
	Bath Local	1036	4.1	9.9
	Elida Local	1164	3.5	18.5
	Perry Local	0	0	9.6
	Shawnee Local	1208	15.6	25.1
	Spencerville Local	1204	3.7	19.5
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe Local	1054	20.1	27.3
	Hamilton City	1054	11.8	7.5
	Middletown City	1016	8	23.2
	Edgewood City	1114	4.7	17.2
	Fairfield City	1072	25.7	22.1
	Lakota Local	1100	51	29.7
	Madison Local	1006	8.2	20.4
	New Miami Local	0	0	0
	Ross Local	1016	33.9	15.4
	Talawanda City	1072	22.7	24
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield City	1090	13.6	13.5
	Greenon Local	1120	14.1	26.7
	Tecumseh Local	1050	13.9	17.9
	Northeastern Local	1088	5.6	16.6
	Northwestern Local	1094	6.5	23.4
	Southeastern Local	960	1.7	18.3
	Clark-Shawnee Local	1002	28.7	11.4
<b>Madison</b>	London City	994	16.4	16.4
	Jefferson Local	1086	4.8	18.3

<b>Marion</b>	Jonathan Alder Local	1144	7.9	24.4
	Madison-Plains Local	1060	4.7	19.7
	Marion City	1040	5.4	0
	Elgin Local	1020	3.8	0
	Pleasant Local	1104	10	0
	Ridgedale Local	0	0	19
<b>Richland</b>	River Valley Local	1052	9.3	17.8
	Mansfield City	1008	2.4	8.7
	Shelby City	1224	1.9	30.4
	Clear Fork Valley Local	1186	1.4	26.4
	Crestview Local	950	3.8	24.4
	Lexington Local	1136	9.6	26.3
	Lucas Local	1460	2.2	19.6
	Madison Local	1000	0.5	16.1
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	0	0	13.7
<b>Scioto</b>	Ontario Local	1188	6.3	17.2
	New Boston Local	960	6.7	30
	Portsmouth City	900	2.9	1
	Bloom-Vernon Local	1190	1.4	20
	Clay Local	0	0	15.2
	Green Local	810	2.2	42.2
	Minford Local	830	0.9	0
	Northwest Local	990	0.9	0
	Valley Local	1106	3.4	28.1
	Washington-Nile Local	1040	2	19.6
<b>Seneca</b>	Wheelersburg Local	1198	4.1	21.4
	Tiffin City	1044	9.2	18.4
	Fostoria City	950	1.7	5.9
	Seneca East Local	1152	5.1	20.5
	Bettsville Local	750	6.7	20
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	1140	4.1	39.2
	New Riegel Local	1160	3.3	26.7
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Old Fort Local	1140	2.2	15.2
	Claymont City	0	0	11.2
	Dover City	1058	2.7	9.7
	New Philadelphia City	1132	4.5	18.2
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	610	1.3	12.7
	Garaway Local	0	0	33.3
	Indian Valley Local	0	0	12.9
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	0	0	16.7
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	1062	3	16.8

<b>Warren</b>	Franklin City	1044	2	22.4
	Lebanon City	1128	12	21.4
	Carlisle Local	1216	2.7	0
	Springboro Community City	1124	33.8	35.7
	Kings Local	1122	36.9	35.1
	Little Miami Local	1016	19.5	28.9
	Mason City	1132	47.5	36.8
	Wayne Local	1018	15	27.6
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>913.9</b>	<b>8.2</b>	<b>18.8</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>952.0</b>	<b>11.9</b>	<b>18.4</b>

## 2009-2010

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Number of standards met (out of 26)</b>	<b>Read 4th grade 2009-10 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Math 4th grade 2009-10 % at or above proficient</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	25	<b>94.4</b>	<b>89.9</b>
	Lima City	3	<b>69.4</b>	<b>62.2</b>
	Bluffton Exempted Village	26	<b>92.4</b>	<b>86.1</b>
	Allen East Local	21	<b>81.7</b>	<b>80.3</b>
	Bath Local	26	<b>82.7</b>	<b>78.4</b>
	Elida Local	21	<b>82.6</b>	<b>81.6</b>
	Perry Local	13	<b>82.9</b>	<b>87.1</b>
	Shawnee Local	25	<b>86.8</b>	<b>85.4</b>
	Spencerville Local	25	<b>87.9</b>	<b>86.4</b>
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe Local	26	<b>82.4</b>	<b>81</b>
	Middletown City	5	<b>70.6</b>	<b>54.7</b>
	Hamilton City	18	<b>81.3</b>	<b>73.6</b>
	Edgewood City	23	<b>85</b>	<b>75.2</b>
	Fairfield City	25	<b>87.7</b>	<b>83.2</b>
	Lakota Local	26	<b>88.5</b>	<b>86.7</b>
	Madison Local	18	<b>80.8</b>	<b>73.7</b>
	New Miami Local	15	<b>67.3</b>	<b>65.4</b>
	Ross Local	25	<b>96.9</b>	<b>92</b>
	Talawanda City	24	<b>88.9</b>	<b>85.2</b>
<b>Clark</b>	Springfield City	2	<b>62.9</b>	<b>53.1</b>
	Greenon Local	25	<b>80.8</b>	<b>78.4</b>
	Tecumseh Local	20	<b>85.2</b>	<b>80</b>

	Northeastern Local	21	84.3	83.4
	Northwestern Local	22	85.8	71.6
	Southeastern Local	25	88.5	78.7
	Clark-Shawnee Local	24	88.9	88.9
<b>Madison</b>	London City	17	81.9	75
	Jefferson Local	19	68.2	75
	Jonathan Alder Local	26	87	79.2
	Madison-Plains Local	21	86.3	82.9
<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	0	68.6	61.3
	Elgin Local	12	73.7	72.6
	Pleasant Local	24	88.2	88.2
	Ridgedale Local	5	69.7	57.6
	River Valley Local	19	81.6	84.2
<b>Richland</b>	Mansfield City	5	58.1	46.2
	Shelby City	22	90.4	83.2
	Clear Fork Valley Local	25	92.1	90.6
	Crestview Local	21	94.3	87.6
	Lexington Local	25	97.8	91.3
	Lucas Local	19	88.1	83.3
	Madison Local	16	78.2	72.8
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	22	95.5	90.9
	Ontario Local	24	91.5	86.9
<b>Scioto</b>	New Boston Local	16	73.3	63.3
	Portsmouth City	11	77.1	66.7
	Bloom-Vernon Local	26	90.9	84.8
	Clay Local	19	76	84
	Green Local	13	78.7	72.3
	Minford Local	20	80.2	82
	Northwest Local	15	74.4	65.9
	Valley Local	19	80.3	77
	Washington-Nile Local	18	87.2	88.8
	Wheelersburg Local	23	85.2	84.3
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	26	89.8	83.5
	Fostoria City	14	77.7	80.1
	Seneca East Local	21	84.2	80.5
	Bettsville Local	16	80	80
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	26	89.6	86.6
	New Riegel Local	24	90.3	93.5
	Old Fort Local	26	90	90
<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	21	85.6	89.9
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	17	75	77.8
	Dover City	26	87	86

<b>Warren</b>	New Philadelphia City	24	<b>86.5</b>	<b>78.6</b>
	Garaway Local	26	<b>95.7</b>	<b>86.2</b>
	Indian Valley Local	23	<b>88.2</b>	<b>79.2</b>
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	20	<b>80.4</b>	<b>72.5</b>
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	26	<b>91.7</b>	<b>83.5</b>
	Lebanon City	26	<b>89.8</b>	<b>86.6</b>
	Franklin City	19	<b>85.8</b>	<b>78.3</b>
	Carlisle Local	21	<b>91.5</b>	<b>94.1</b>
	Springboro Community City	26	<b>93.5</b>	<b>92</b>
	Kings Local	26	<b>95.8</b>	<b>96.5</b>
	Little Miami Local	26	<b>90.3</b>	<b>89.6</b>
	Mason City	26	<b>96.1</b>	<b>95.3</b>
	Wayne Local	26	<b>91.7</b>	<b>90.8</b>
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>20.3</b>	<b>84.3</b>	<b>80.4</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>20.9</b>	<b>85.2</b>	<b>80.9</b>

### 2009-2010, cont.

County	District Name	Science 8th grade 2009-10 % at or above proficient	Read OGT 2009-10 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2009-10 % at or above proficient
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	76.6	82.9	86.7
	Lima City	27.5	66.3	66.3
	Bluffton Exempted Village	87	90.5	89.3
	Allen East Local	54.9	79	77.8
	Bath Local	81.1	89.4	89.4
	Elida Local	69.2	88.5	84.5
	Perry Local	45.3	75.4	72.1
	Shawnee Local	78.4	92.4	90.2
	Spencerville Local	80.3	81.5	86.4
<b>Butler</b>				
	Monroe Local	78.3	90.5	85
	Middletown City	36.1	75	70.4
	Hamilton City	51.6	80.6	81.5
	Edgewood City	63.4	85.2	81.5
	Fairfield City	78.5	87.8	86.2
	Lakota Local	83.2	94.7	91.2
	Madison Local	57.7	89	89.8
	New Miami Local	64.3	84.3	82.4
	Ross Local	78.5	93.8	92.9
	Talawanda City	73.4	94.1	91.6

<b>Clark</b>	Springfield City	33	71.3	65.4
	Greenon Local	76.5	88	89.7
	Tecumseh Local	60.9	83.6	83.1
	Northeastern Local	73.2	88.2	84.3
	Northwestern Local	77.8	93.2	93.2
	Southeastern Local	72.3	92.5	94
	Clark-Shawnee Local	74	90	90.5
<b>Madison</b>	London City	46.3	86.2	82.1
	Jefferson Local	57.1	93.7	87.4
	Jonathan Alder Local	86.8	94.5	90.9
	Madison-Plains Local	58	83.6	82
<b>Marion</b>	Marion City	45	68.2	68.8
	Elgin Local	67	78.3	78.3
	Pleasant Local	70.8	88.7	80.6
	Ridgedale Local	37.7	83.3	62.3
	River Valley Local	69.9	83.2	83.9
<b>Richland</b>	Mansfield City	19.9	66.7	61.8
	Shelby City	60	89	85.6
	Clear Fork Valley Local	87.3	85.3	80.9
	Crestview Local	71.1	92.2	92.2
	Lexington Local	74.9	91.3	88.3
	Lucas Local	68.9	85.4	92.7
	Madison Local	57.7	83.4	80.8
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	82.8	85.9	82.8
	Ontario Local	71.1	92.4	88.6
<b>Scioto</b>	New Boston Local	60.7	85.2	92.6
	Portsmouth City	58	76.3	74.2
	Bloom-Vernon Local	79.3	84.1	95.7
	Clay Local	50	80.6	77.8
	Green Local	36.1	80	82.5
	Minford Local	55.3	83.7	80.4
	Northwest Local	52.7	83.8	76.2
	Valley Local	80.6	90.4	91.6
	Washington-Nile Local	77	77.4	79.6
	Wheelersburg Local	90.3	93.4	88.2
<b>Seneca</b>	Tiffin City	76.1	88	85.9
	Fostoria City	46.8	83.9	79
	Seneca East Local	67.1	86.3	76.8
	Bettsville Local	50	94.4	94.4
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	82.4	86.1	94.4
	New Riegel Local	76.7	91.9	97.3
	Old Fort Local	80	95.1	97.6

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Claymont City	62.4	77.1	79.6
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	63.5	80.7	90.4
	Dover City	77.2	88.5	90.1
	New Philadelphia City	76.2	86.5	93
	Garaway Local	79.2	86.6	87.8
	Indian Valley Local	79.3	94.2	93.4
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	72	90.5	95.2
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	79.4	89.6	86.1
<b>Warren</b>	Lebanon City	81.1	91.6	92.4
	Franklin City	71.3	90.4	88.2
	Carlisle Local	68.5	87.5	92.5
	Springboro Community City	83.8	96.6	96.6
	Kings Local	89.2	93.8	89.2
	Little Miami Local	87.2	91.3	87.4
	Mason City	89.8	95.9	96.7
	Wayne Local	91.6	94	93.2
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>68.0</b>	<b>86.4</b>	<b>85.5</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>70.4</b>	<b>86.7</b>	<b>85.3</b>

### 2009-2010, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Read 11th grade 2009-10 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Math 11th grade 2009- 10 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Write 11th grade 2009-10 % at or above proficient</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	100	100	100
	Lima City	82.3	79.9	86.1
	Bluffton Exempted Village	94.8	94.8	97.9
	Allen East Local	97.4	90.9	94.8
	Bath Local	94.6	95.3	96.9
	Elida Local	93	95.2	95.7
	Perry Local	80	71.7	86.7
	Shawnee Local	100	99	99.5
	Spencerville Local	97	98.5	95.5
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe Local	97.1	94.7	99.4
	Middletown City	88.7	86.1	92.7
	Hamilton City	93.5	94.2	95.8
	Edgewood City	95.3	91.4	96.9
	Fairfield City	95.1	93.9	97.7
	Lakota Local	97.9	95.7	97.6
	Madison Local	95	94.2	95.9
	New Miami Local	94.1	96.1	92.2

<b>Clark</b>	Ross Local	96.5	96.1	97.2
	Talawanda City	97.7	94.6	96.4
	Springfield City	83.2	77.2	86.8
	Greenon Local	95.5	94.2	98.1
	Tecumseh Local	92.1	89.7	92.1
	Northeastern Local	95.8	91.9	95.4
	Northwestern Local	98.6	99.3	97.1
	Southeastern Local	96.6	96.6	94.9
	Clark-Shawnee Local	93.3	93.8	93.8
<b>Madison</b>				
	London City	94.4	95.2	95.2
	Jefferson Local	96.3	95.4	98.2
	Jonathan Alder Local	98.1	98.1	98.1
	Madison-Plains Local	92.3	94	94.9
<b>Marion</b>				
	Marion City	80	82.3	81.3
	Elgin Local	87.4	85.9	91.9
	Pleasant Local	95.6	96.4	98.2
	Ridgedale Local	83.5	78.5	83.5
	River Valley Local	94.2	93.5	96.4
<b>Richland</b>				
	Mansfield City	87.3	85.8	89.2
	Shelby City	89.4	91.2	92.4
	Clear Fork Valley Local	92.1	91.4	92.8
	Crestview Local	93.5	92.4	93.5
	Lexington Local	93.7	93.3	96.9
	Lucas Local	95.9	93.9	93.9
	Madison Local	92.8	91.1	95.3
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	94	94	94
	Ontario Local	97.3	95.3	98.6
<b>Scioto</b>				
	New Boston Local	91.3	87	95.7
	Portsmouth City	89.4	87.2	87.9
	Bloom-Vernon Local	93.9	97	97
	Clay Local	97.3	94.6	97.3
	Green Local	83.7	86	86
	Minford Local	95.1	93.4	93.4
	Northwest Local	91.4	88.3	93.8
	Valley Local	94.3	93.1	93.1
	Washington-Nile Local	92.7	93.6	95.4
	Wheelersburg Local	95.4	94.5	98.2
<b>Seneca</b>				
	Tiffin City	96	91.9	98
	Fostoria City	90.9	86.8	94.2
	Seneca East Local	95.6	94.4	95.6
	Bettsville Local	94.4	94.4	100
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	100	98.5	100



<b>Tuscarawas</b>	New Riegel Local	100	100	100
	Old Fort Local	97.4	94.7	100
	Claymont City	92.6	93.3	94.8
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	91.5	94.4	94.4
	Dover City	95	96.1	95
	New Philadelphia City	94.9	94.9	95.8
	Garaway Local	99	97	99
	Indian Valley Local	92.4	93.3	95.2
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	93.3	93.3	95
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	97	97.8	97
<b>Warren</b>				
	Lebanon City	97	95.9	97.6
	Franklin City	89.4	87.1	92.5
	Carlisle Local	90.4	91.1	91.9
	Springboro Community City	98.2	96.8	99.5
	Kings Local	95.1	94.1	96.9
	Little Miami Local	97.2	96.4	99.2
	Mason City	98.3	98	98.9
	Wayne Local	95.9	95.9	97.5
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>93.8</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>95.1</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>94.0</b>	<b>93.0</b>	<b>95.3</b>

### 2009-2010, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Final graduation rate 2008- 09</b>	<b>Performance Index Score 2009-10</b>	<b>Mean ACT Score 2008-09</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	98.6	98.5	21
	Lima City	61.7	80.5	18
	Bluffton Exempted Village	97.8	104.4	23
	Allen East Local	97.9	94.1	20
	Bath Local	95.9	99	21
	Elida Local	94.9	96.6	22
	Perry Local	89.5	93	22
	Shawnee Local	94.1	100.7	23
	Spencerville Local	87.9	98.8	21
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe Local	98.1	100.2	20
	Middletown City	79.1	82.3	20
	Hamilton City	90.7	91.8	21
	Edgewood City	95.3	96	21
	Fairfield City	96.3	99	22
	Lakota Local	93.1	104.2	23
	Madison Local	95	94.1	20
	New Miami Local	94.4	89.5	18

<b>Clark</b>	Ross Local	<b>89.9</b>	<b>104.4</b>	22
	Talawanda City	<b>98.5</b>	<b>100.9</b>	22
	Springfield City	<b>74.8</b>	<b>78.6</b>	19
	Greenon Local	<b>95.1</b>	<b>99.7</b>	23
	Tecumseh Local	<b>87.4</b>	<b>94.9</b>	21
	Northeastern Local	<b>96.3</b>	<b>97.2</b>	22
	Northwestern Local	<b>95.1</b>	<b>97.8</b>	22
	Southeastern Local	<b>97</b>	<b>101</b>	21
	Clark-Shawnee Local	<b>92.9</b>	<b>100.3</b>	22
<b>Madison</b>				
	London City	<b>97.9</b>	<b>90.2</b>	20
	Jefferson Local	<b>98.8</b>	<b>94.2</b>	21
	Jonathan Alder Local	<b>96.8</b>	<b>102.5</b>	22
	Madison-Plains Local	<b>94.1</b>	<b>94.6</b>	21
<b>Marion</b>				
	Marion City	<b>68.1</b>	<b>82.2</b>	21
	Elgin Local	<b>87.9</b>	<b>89.1</b>	21
	Pleasant Local	<b>92.4</b>	<b>97.7</b>	21
	Ridgedale Local	<b>82.4</b>	<b>85.2</b>	20
	River Valley Local	<b>91.7</b>	<b>94.9</b>	22
<b>Richland</b>				
	Mansfield City	<b>79.4</b>	<b>77.3</b>	20
	Shelby City	<b>94.7</b>	<b>97.4</b>	21
	Clear Fork Valley Local	<b>94.4</b>	<b>99</b>	22
	Crestview Local	<b>89.9</b>	<b>100</b>	22
	Lexington Local	<b>95.3</b>	<b>102.6</b>	22
	Lucas Local	<b>92.5</b>	<b>95.9</b>	20
	Madison Local	<b>87.4</b>	<b>91.8</b>	21
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	<b>86.6</b>	<b>96.8</b>	21
	Ontario Local	<b>96.5</b>	<b>99.3</b>	22
<b>Scioto</b>				
	New Boston Local	<b>100</b>	<b>88.4</b>	19
	Portsmouth City	<b>91.6</b>	<b>86</b>	18
	Bloom-Vernon Local	<b>98.5</b>	<b>99.6</b>	21
	Clay Local	<b>93.8</b>	<b>93.9</b>	19
	Green Local	<b>92.3</b>	<b>87.6</b>	21
	Minford Local	<b>99.2</b>	<b>93.6</b>	21
	Northwest Local	<b>96.5</b>	<b>90</b>	20
	Valley Local	<b>100</b>	<b>96.3</b>	22
	Washington-Nile Local	<b>90.4</b>	<b>94</b>	21
	Wheelersburg Local	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	21
<b>Seneca</b>				
	Tiffin City	<b>90.4</b>	<b>99.7</b>	22
	Fostoria City	<b>73</b>	<b>88.9</b>	21
	Seneca East Local	<b>98.9</b>	<b>97</b>	21
	Bettsville Local	<b>100</b>	<b>91.2</b>	21
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	<b>100</b>	<b>100.8</b>	21

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	New Riegel Local	<b>97.1</b>	<b>100.4</b>	23
	Old Fort Local	<b>97.7</b>	<b>103.6</b>	21
	Claymont City	<b>93.3</b>	<b>94.2</b>	20
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	<b>89.6</b>	<b>93</b>	20
	Dover City	<b>93.6</b>	<b>100.1</b>	23
	New Philadelphia City	<b>95.7</b>	<b>98.1</b>	21
	Garaway Local	<b>95.5</b>	<b>102.8</b>	21
	Indian Valley Local	<b>93.4</b>	<b>99.2</b>	21
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	<b>91.7</b>	<b>96.3</b>	21
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	<b>97.3</b>	<b>100.2</b>	23
<b>Warren</b>				
	Lebanon City	<b>98.1</b>	<b>102.8</b>	22
	Franklin City	<b>88.5</b>	<b>95.8</b>	21
	Carlisle Local	<b>95.6</b>	<b>96.9</b>	20
	Springboro Community City	<b>94.4</b>	<b>105</b>	24
	Kings Local	<b>96.1</b>	<b>105.8</b>	23
	Little Miami Local	<b>96.5</b>	<b>102.8</b>	22
	Mason City	<b>99</b>	<b>109.4</b>	25
	Wayne Local	<b>96.4</b>	<b>104.7</b>	22
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>92.8</b>	<b>96.2</b>	<b>21.2</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>94.0</b>	<b>97.1</b>	<b>21.4</b>

### 2009-2010, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Mean SAT Score 2008-09</b>	<b>% Graduates Participating in SAT 2008- 09</b>	<b>% Graduates Graduating with Honors Diploma 2008-09</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Delphos City	1170	1.4	32.9
	Lima City	860	0.5	9.6
	Bluffton Exempted Village	1196	2.2	33
	Allen East Local	0	0	21.3
	Bath Local	1020	2.2	11.5
	Elida Local	1290	1.1	25.3
	Perry Local	0	0	15.7
	Shawnee Local	1230	12.6	18.8
	Spencerville Local	1060	1.3	7.5
<b>Butler</b>	Monroe Local	914	14.6	29.1
	Middletown City	1012	6.6	19.2
	Hamilton City	1072	8.8	7.7
	Edgewood City	886	2.3	22.9
	Fairfield City	1052	23.8	20.7
	Lakota Local	1102	43.8	27.8
	Madison Local	1010	1.8	21.2

<b>Clark</b>	New Miami Local	800	1.5	0
	Ross Local	1010	17.1	9.3
	Talawanda City	1042	18.5	17.6
	Springfield City	1114	4.9	10.8
	Greenon Local	1128	21.2	33.3
	Tecumseh Local	1058	11.6	14.4
	Northeastern Local	1024	4.1	20
	Northwestern Local	1020	2.2	16.3
	Southeastern Local	1052	15.4	12.3
<b>Madison</b>	Clark-Shawnee Local	1082	22.4	30.1
	London City	958	25.2	13.7
	Jefferson Local	1080	2.4	24.1
	Jonathan Alder Local	1132	8.6	29.6
<b>Marion</b>	Madison-Plains Local	1124	3.2	21.1
	Marion City	1074	4.3	10.1
	Elgin Local	0	0	21.1
	Pleasant Local	0	0	29.8
<b>Richland</b>	Ridgedale Local	0	0	14.8
	River Valley Local	1126	4.9	17.2
	Mansfield City	1010	3	6.5
	Shelby City	930	1.1	17.8
	Clear Fork Valley Local	1080	0.7	21.5
	Crestview Local	1100	2.5	12.5
	Lexington Local	1158	6.9	22.3
	Lucas Local	0	0	5.4
	Madison Local	1206	0.9	13.6
<b>Scioto</b>	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	0	0	19.7
	Ontario Local	1140	3.6	24.5
	New Boston Local	0	0	34.5
	Portsmouth City	954	3.1	0
	Bloom-Vernon Local	1140	3	24.2
	Clay Local	0	0	17.8
	Green Local	0	0	31.3
	Minford Local	0	0	10.1
	Northwest Local	1350	0.9	0
<b>Seneca</b>	Valley Local	1120	1.1	30.3
	Washington-Nile Local	1180	1.1	20.2
	Wheelersburg Local	1130	2.8	18.3
	Tiffin City	1106	3.7	24.9
	Fostoria City	1250	1.9	14.6
	Seneca East Local	1178	4.3	26.1
	Bettsville Local	0	0	6.7

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Hopewell-Loudon Local	1190	3	40.3
	New Riegel Local	0	0	35.3
	Old Fort Local	1046	7	18.6
	Claymont City	0	0	7.1
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	970	2.9	5.8
	Dover City	1146	1.9	24.2
	New Philadelphia City	1116	5.9	15.8
	Garaway Local	820	1.2	25
	Indian Valley Local	0	0	13.2
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	1066	6.8	18.2
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	1326	2.8	13.9
<b>Warren</b>				
	Lebanon City	1094	9.7	17.6
	Franklin City	880	0.6	22.9
	Carlisle Local	1000	3.8	12.2
	Springboro Community City	1114	31.7	34.9
	Kings Local	1116	37.9	27.8
	Little Miami Local	1064	16.2	35.3
	Mason City	1140	48.8	41.3
	Wayne Local	1046	13	29.6
<b>Significant Counties Average</b>		<b>868.4</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>19.6</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>952.4</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>19.0</b>

## 2010-2011

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Number of standards met (out of 26)</b>	<b>Read 4th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Math 4th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</b>	<b>Read 8th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Lima City	5	<b>70.6</b>	<b>65</b>	64.7
	Delphos City	25	<b>94.3</b>	<b>87.1</b>	92.6
	Bluffton Exempted Village	26	<b>91.8</b>	<b>91.8</b>	96.7
	Allen East Local	23	<b>92.6</b>	<b>90.1</b>	73.0
	Bath Local	23	<b>91.5</b>	<b>82.4</b>	94.0
	Elida Local	23	<b>85.8</b>	<b>81.6</b>	86.3
	Perry Local	19	<b>85.7</b>	<b>80</b>	85.7
	Shawnee Local	26	<b>92.9</b>	<b>86.3</b>	92.7
	Spencerville Local	26	<b>90.4</b>	<b>80.8</b>	89.7
<b>Butler</b>	Middletown City	10	<b>79.0</b>	<b>66.4</b>	76.4
	Edgewood City	25	<b>88.2</b>	<b>81.1</b>	87.5
	Fairfield City	23	<b>91.0</b>	<b>86.9</b>	89.7
	Lakota Local	26	<b>92.8</b>	<b>88.5</b>	95.0
	Madison Local	21	<b>81.1</b>	<b>77.2</b>	89.9

<b>Clark</b>	New Miami Local	16	<b>93.2</b>	<b>86.4</b>	75.0
	Ross Local	26	<b>93.4</b>	<b>92.9</b>	97.8
	Monroe Local	26	<b>90.3</b>	<b>89.2</b>	94.3
	Talawanda City	26	<b>90.8</b>	<b>86.3</b>	92.8
	Springfield City	1	<b>67.7</b>	<b>57.4</b>	68.9
	Greenon Local	24	<b>90.3</b>	<b>79</b>	87.2
	Tecumseh Local	23	<b>87.7</b>	<b>77.5</b>	83.3
	Northeastern Local	25	<b>84.1</b>	<b>82.5</b>	91.5
	Northwestern Local	25	<b>81.2</b>	<b>79.3</b>	96.8
<b>Madison</b>	Southeastern Local	24	<b>83.6</b>	<b>83.6</b>	90.9
	Clark-Shawnee Local	24	<b>89.3</b>	<b>83.9</b>	92.4
	London City	16	<b>77.6</b>	<b>75.2</b>	78.7
	Jefferson Local	21	<b>75.9</b>	<b>68.7</b>	88.8
<b>Marion</b>	Jonathan Alder Local	26	<b>92.1</b>	<b>89.6</b>	94.9
	Madison-Plains Local	19	<b>84.4</b>	<b>77.1</b>	77
	Marion City	6	<b>71.2</b>	<b>65.5</b>	62.1
	Elgin Local	14	<b>76.3</b>	<b>71</b>	78.6
<b>Richland</b>	Pleasant Local	24	<b>85.7</b>	<b>85.7</b>	91.8
	Ridgedale Local	14	<b>70.4</b>	<b>53.7</b>	83.6
	River Valley Local	23	<b>86.4</b>	<b>81</b>	88.2
	Mansfield City	5	<b>70.2</b>	<b>63.1</b>	68.2
	Shelby City	23	<b>88.8</b>	<b>81.8</b>	90.6
	Clear Fork Valley Local	25	<b>88.2</b>	<b>84.7</b>	90
	Crestview Local	26	<b>94.6</b>	<b>92.4</b>	94.6
	Lexington Local	26	<b>92.8</b>	<b>87.4</b>	91.2
	Lucas Local	20	<b>86.5</b>	<b>88.5</b>	92.7
<b>Scioto</b>	Madison Local	17	<b>80</b>	<b>77.1</b>	83.8
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	24	<b>88.3</b>	<b>74</b>	90.2
	Ontario Local	26	<b>93.3</b>	<b>86.7</b>	88.6
	Bloom-Vernon Local	24	<b>92.5</b>	<b>91.3</b>	95.5
	Clay Local	17	<b>90</b>	<b>88.3</b>	75
	Green Local	20	<b>88.1</b>	<b>85.7</b>	87
	Minford Local	20	<b>92.9</b>	<b>85</b>	85.3
	New Boston Local	16	<b>71.8</b>	<b>46.2</b>	71.4
	Northwest Local	17	<b>75.6</b>	<b>64.4</b>	82.5
<b>Seneca</b>	Portsmouth City	13	<b>78.2</b>	<b>69.4</b>	78.8
	Valley Local	22	<b>82.4</b>	<b>75</b>	80.6
	Washington-Nile Local	22	<b>82.3</b>	<b>70.8</b>	85.7
	Wheelersburg Local	26	<b>86.7</b>	<b>82.9</b>	94.3
<b>Seneca</b>	Bettsville Local	16	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>	84.6
	Fostoria City	12	<b>78.7</b>	<b>72.1</b>	73.1
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	25	<b>94.7</b>	<b>94.7</b>	86.2

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	New Riegel Local	26	<b>100</b>	<b>86.4</b>	96.6
	Old Fort Local	25	<b>88.9</b>	<b>91.7</b>	93.2
	Seneca East Local	24	<b>89.4</b>	<b>89.4</b>	88.4
	Tiffin City	25	<b>91.2</b>	<b>87.6</b>	88.6
	Garaway Local	26	<b>92.2</b>	<b>78.6</b>	96.1
	Indian Valley Local	24	<b>85.2</b>	<b>88.1</b>	83.1
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	19	<b>80.8</b>	<b>74.4</b>	87.5
	New Philadelphia City	25	<b>79</b>	<b>83</b>	89.7
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	23	<b>81.5</b>	<b>85.2</b>	97.7
<b>Warren</b>	Tuscarawas Valley Local	26	<b>97.3</b>	<b>91.1</b>	93.3
	Carlisle Local	25	<b>90.6</b>	<b>92</b>	87.1
	Franklin City	22	<b>88.3</b>	<b>81.1</b>	87.6
	Kings Local	26	<b>97.2</b>	<b>96.9</b>	95.7
	Lebanon City	26	<b>93.4</b>	<b>86.6</b>	94.8
	Little Miami Local	26	<b>95.4</b>	<b>88.7</b>	91.5
	Mason City	26	<b>98.1</b>	<b>95.5</b>	96.7
	Springboro Community City	26	<b>94.1</b>	<b>90.3</b>	93.9
	Wayne Local	26	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	97.3
<b>Sig County Average</b>		<b>20.9</b>	<b>85.4</b>	<b>79.7</b>	<b>86.3</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>21.9</b>	<b>87.8</b>	<b>82.7</b>	<b>88.2</b>

### 2010-2011, cont.

County	District Name	Science 8th grade			
		2010-11 % at or above proficient	Read OGT 2010-11 % at or above proficient	Math OGT 2010-11 % at or above proficient	Write OGT 2010-11 % at or above proficient
<b>Allen</b>	Lima City	31.1	75.8	58.3	75.2
	Delphos City	82.1	95.7	94.3	98.6
	Bluffton Exempted Village	84.4	98.8	95.3	98.8
	Allen East Local	68.8	95	82.5	95
	Bath Local	80.5	93.5	91.2	92.6
	Elida Local	80.4	89.7	87.7	94.1
	Perry Local	64.3	83	88.7	90.6
	Shawnee Local	86.9	94.5	96	94.9
	Spencerville Local	82.8	90.9	88.3	93.5
<b>Butler</b>	Middletown City	43.4	77.8	69.1	81.6
	Edgewood City	76.1	88	86.1	90
	Fairfield City	72.2	91.2	87.3	92.3
	Lakota Local	87.5	96.6	93.9	96.7
	Madison Local	66.7	97.6	93.5	93.4

<b>Clark</b>	New Miami Local	64.3	89.7	87.9	91.4
	Ross Local	84.5	94.3	96.1	96.1
	Monroe Local	85.8	92.6	90.8	93.3
	Talawanda City	83	90.6	88.5	91.4
	Springfield City	40.7	72.3	65.4	73.8
	Greenon Local	73.2	90.8	90.1	92.9
	Tecumseh Local	64	87.8	89.5	88.2
	Northeastern Local	80	89.9	88.9	93.7
	Northwestern Local	76.8	95.5	89.7	89
	Southeastern Local	74.2	95.6	92.6	98.5
	Clark-Shawnee Local	80.4	91	90.4	92.7
<b>Madison</b>					
	London City	52.9	91.7	82.1	89
	Jefferson Local	65.3	90.9	87.9	96
	Jonathan Alder Local	90.4	95.8	90.3	92.7
	Madison-Plains Local	63.6	89.9	89	92.7
<b>Marion</b>					
	Marion City	37.9	81.9	76.6	80.3
	Elgin Local	66.1	81.4	72.5	84.3
	Pleasant Local	79.6	87.5	80.2	87.5
	Ridgedale Local	59.3	86.8	78.8	81.1
	River Valley Local	81.3	91.5	88.7	90.1
<b>Richland</b>					
	Mansfield City	31.3	80.1	72.1	84.7
	Shelby City	77.2	90.3	89.1	93.1
	Clear Fork Valley Local	83.6	92.7	88.1	92.1
	Crestview Local	78.5	94.7	86.3	93.7
	Lexington Local	80.4	95.1	91.6	93.8
	Lucas Local	68.3	100	100	100
	Madison Local	71.7	89.9	82.3	88.9
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	90.3	90.5	81.1	85.1
	Ontario Local	77.3	96.4	93.5	97.1
<b>Scioto</b>					
	Bloom-Vernon Local	82.1	90.4	94.5	86.3
	Clay Local	47.9	90.2	85.4	90.2
	Green Local	56.5	96.2	92.3	98.1
	Minford Local	67	91.9	79.8	93.9
	New Boston Local	50	86.2	79.3	93.1
	Northwest Local	49.2	91.3	85.6	89.4
	Portsmouth City	42.4	85.4	80.9	85.4
	Valley Local	65.7	88.6	94.3	95.7
	Washington-Nile Local	74.3	88.1	78	88.1
	Wheelersburg Local	91.9	93.8	92.9	98.2
<b>Seneca</b>	Bettsville Local	61.5	92.9	92.9	100
	Fostoria City	64.4	85	77.6	90.7
	Hopewell-Loudon Local	78.5	95.8	94.4	100



<b>Tuscarawas</b>	New Riegel Local	86.2	100	92.3	96.2
	Old Fort Local	79.5	97	93.9	100
	Seneca East Local	80	91.2	83.3	96.1
	Tiffin City	78.2	91	83.9	93.5
	Garaway Local	85.3	94.4	93.3	94.4
	Indian Valley Local	71.6	97.1	92	98.5
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	78.8	87.2	89.5	90.7
	New Philadelphia City	82.1	94.4	92.2	96.6
	Strasburg-Franklin Local	83.7	90.5	90.5	92.1
<b>Warren</b>	Tuscarawas Valley Local	82.8	95.1	86.9	95.9
	Carlisle Local	75	92	91.1	90.2
	Franklin City	69.5	85.7	83.4	92.2
	Kings Local	88.7	96	96	99
	Lebanon City	84	94.6	93.4	94.4
	Little Miami Local	79.2	93.9	91.1	96.7
	Mason City	92.1	98.6	97.7	97.6
	Springboro Community City	90.2	97.9	97.4	98.7
	Wayne Local	87.5	97.7	94.6	98.5
<b>Sig County Average</b>		<b>71.0</b>	<b>90.8</b>	<b>86.9</b>	<b>92.0</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>73.2</b>	<b>90.7</b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>92.6</b>

## 2010-2011, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<div> <div>Read 11th grade</div> <div>2010-11 % at or above proficient</div> </div> <div> <div>Math 11th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</div> </div> <div> <div>Write 11th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</div> </div> <div> <div>Social Studies 11th grade 2010-11 % at or above proficient</div> </div>			
<b>Allen</b>	Lima City	85.4	76.2	87.9	75.9
	Delphos City	97.2	95.8	98.6	95.8
	Bluffton Exempted Village	97.6	94	97.6	95.2
	Allen East Local	92.3	88.5	92.3	85.9
	Bath Local	96	95.2	95.2	92.8
	Elida Local	97	95.3	97.6	95.9
	Perry Local	87.3	87.3	94.5	83.6
	Shawnee Local	95.7	95.7	96.2	93
	Spencerville Local	93.1	95.8	95.8	87.5
<b>Butler</b>					
	Middletown City	90.8	88	93	85.2
	Edgewood City	93.1	90.5	95.6	90.2
	Fairfield City	95.7	91.1	96.2	90.8
	Lakota Local	98.1	95.6	98.7	96.6

Clark	Madison Local	98.3	96.6	97.5	96.6
	New Miami Local	95.6	95.6	93.3	86.7
	Ross Local	98.2	98.6	97.2	96.3
	Monroe Local	97.9	97.1	100	94.3
	Talawanda City	98	95.2	98.8	96.8
	Springfield City	82.2	79.6	82.7	75.4
	Greenon Local	92.7	93.3	95.5	91.6
	Tecumseh Local	93.8	89.8	93.8	92
	Northeastern Local	95.5	93.7	95.8	93.4
Madison	Northwestern Local	95.7	99.1	95.7	94
	Southeastern Local	100	100	100	98.4
	Clark-Shawnee Local	94.9	94.9	95.4	92.9
	London City	96.5	92.3	95.8	93
Marion	Jefferson Local	97.8	97.8	100	93.3
	Jonathan Alder Local	97.1	95.9	98.3	94.2
	Madison-Plains Local	94.7	92.1	97.4	93
	Marion City	89.5	84.8	82.7	80.9
Richland	Elgin Local	97.8	97.8	96.7	91.4
	Pleasant Local	95.3	94.4	98.1	94.3
	Ridgedale Local	95.1	83.6	88.5	86.9
	River Valley Local	95.7	92.2	95	88.7
Scioto	Mansfield City	86.6	81.3	90.2	77.2
	Shelby City	96.1	92.8	96.1	91.7
	Clear Fork Valley Local	94.2	87.7	94.2	91.3
	Crestview Local	97.8	96.7	98.9	95.7
	Lexington Local	97.1	94.3	96.2	95.2
	Lucas Local	95.3	97.7	97.7	93
	Madison Local	91.8	90	92.7	88.6
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	96.8	93.5	93.5	91.9
	Ontario Local	96.2	96.2	97.7	95.4
Seneca	Bloom-Vernon Local	92.1	98.4	96.8	90.5
	Clay Local	94.9	84.6	97.4	89.7
	Green Local	95.1	90.2	92.7	85.4
	Minford Local	95.7	95.7	94.7	93.6
	New Boston Local	93.1	93.1	93.1	89.7
	Northwest Local	92.9	88.4	90.2	86.6
	Portsmouth City	87	87	88	83.7
	Valley Local	91.3	93.8	93.8	87.5
	Washington-Nile Local	95.4	92	93.1	90.8
	Wheelersburg Local	97.3	91.8	97.3	95.9
	Bettsville Local	100	93.8	93.8	100
	Fostoria City	95	89.3	91.7	86.8

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Hopewell-Loudon Local	97.2	98.6	100	95.8
	New Riegel Local	94.7	100	97.4	92.1
	Old Fort Local	100	100	100	100
	Seneca East Local	100	93.1	98.9	94.3
	Tiffin City	96.2	94	96.2	94.5
	Garaway Local	94.2	95.3	95.3	90.7
	Indian Valley Local	100	96.7	100	97.6
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	91.3	95	92.5	91.3
	New Philadelphia City	92	94.2	96	90.6
<b>Warren</b>	Strasburg-Franklin Local	95.1	97.6	97.6	95.1
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	94.8	87	94.8	90.4
	Carlisle Local	98.1	97.2	98.1	96.3
	Franklin City	96.4	94.3	96.9	94.3
	Kings Local	96.5	96.1	97.6	94.9
	Lebanon City	98	97.2	98.5	95.7
	Little Miami Local	98.1	96.6	99.3	93.7
	Mason City	99.5	98.8	99.7	98.5
	Springboro Community City	99.2	97.8	99.2	97.8
<b>Sig County Average</b>	Wayne Local	97.7	96.9	100	96.9
		<b>94.8</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>95.2</b>	<b>91.2</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>95.2</b>	<b>93.3</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>92.0</b>

## 2010-2011, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Current Graduation rate 2009- 10</b>	<b>Performance Index Score 2010-11</b>	<b>Mean ACT Score 2009-10</b>	<b>% Graduates Participating in ACT 2009-10</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Lima City	<b>70.2</b>	<b>80.6</b>	18	58.9
	Delphos City	<b>94.3</b>	<b>101.2</b>	20	65.9
	Bluffton Exempted Village	<b>100</b>	<b>106.8</b>	22	78.4
	Allen East Local	<b>92.4</b>	<b>100.3</b>	21	68.5
	Bath Local	<b>88.2</b>	<b>99</b>	22	60.6
	Elida Local	<b>90.6</b>	<b>97.9</b>	22	67.7
	Perry Local	<b>95.1</b>	<b>96.3</b>	20	50
	Shawnee Local	<b>95.4</b>	<b>104.2</b>	23	72.4
	Spencerville Local	<b>96.1</b>	<b>101.5</b>	21	57.5
<b>Butler</b>	Middletown City	<b>82</b>	<b>85.9</b>	20	55.6
	Edgewood City	<b>94.4</b>	<b>98.2</b>	21	64
	Fairfield City	<b>95.5</b>	<b>99.1</b>	22	63.1
	Lakota Local	<b>95.2</b>	<b>105.9</b>	23	72.1

<b>Clark</b>	Madison Local	89.1	98.6	21	58.9
	New Miami Local	96.9	94.8	19	31.7
	Ross Local	96.2	105.9	22	60.8
	Monroe Local	96.1	101.8	21	67.3
	Talawanda City	99.2	102.1	23	65.6
	Springfield City	75.9	81.5	19	42
	Greenon Local	90.6	100	22	56.3
	Tecumseh Local	89.7	96.6	22	47.2
	Northeastern Local	96.6	99.4	21	61.7
<b>Madison</b>	Northwestern Local	95.6	99	21	57.9
	Southeastern Local	100	100.8	22	44.6
	Clark-Shawnee Local	93.9	100.3	22	61.3
	London City	95.9	91.7	21	64.4
<b>Marion</b>	Jefferson Local	95.2	96.5	20	61.6
	Jonathan Alder Local	99.3	103.2	22	66.9
	Madison-Plains Local	93.4	95.4	22	62.8
	Marion City	72.3	85.9	21	42.1
<b>Richland</b>	Elgin Local	84.7	91.3	21	52
	Pleasant Local	89.6	99.1	22	76.8
	Ridgedale Local	87.7	88.1	21	59.6
	River Valley Local	90.8	96.5	22	66.1
<b>Scioto</b>	Mansfield City	83.7	82.6	19	54.9
	Shelby City	92.1	99	22	56.7
	Clear Fork Valley Local	94.4	100.2	22	60.3
	Crestview Local	94.6	101.5	21	55.2
	Lexington Local	97.1	103.3	24	76.7
	Lucas Local	90.9	98.9	21	72
	Madison Local	86.7	94.1	21	45.5
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	93.7	98.8	20	49.2
	Ontario Local	98.3	101.7	21	73.7
<b>Seneca</b>	Bloom-Vernon Local	98.7	100.4	20	66.7
	Clay Local	95	95.5	21	78.9
	Green Local	98.2	96.4	19	59.3
	Minford Local	95.8	97.5	20	66.3
	New Boston Local	100	88.4	19	83.3
	Northwest Local	97.5	92.2	20	46.1
	Portsmouth City	91.8	87.2	20	36.6
	Valley Local	100	97.9	21	62.9
	Washington-Nile Local	98.2	96.4	20	54.2
	Wheelersburg Local	100	102.3	22	73.5
	Bettsville Local	100	93.5	18	68.8
	Fostoria City	75.7	89.4	20	56.3

<b>Tuscarawas</b>	Hopewell-Loudon Local	<b>100</b>	<b>101.6</b>	22	73
	New Riegel Local	<b>100</b>	<b>103.2</b>	23	70.6
	Old Fort Local	<b>100</b>	<b>102.7</b>	22	47.5
	Seneca East Local	<b>93.9</b>	<b>98.1</b>	22	59.1
	Tiffin City	<b>93.1</b>	<b>99.8</b>	21	65.1
	Garaway Local	<b>100</b>	<b>103.7</b>	22	67.4
	Indian Valley Local	<b>96.3</b>	<b>99.8</b>	21	53.5
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	<b>98.8</b>	<b>95.6</b>	21	48.2
	New Philadelphia City	<b>94</b>	<b>100.9</b>	22	60.8
<b>Warren</b>	Strasburg-Franklin Local	<b>96.2</b>	<b>99</b>	21	62
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	<b>99.1</b>	<b>102.2</b>	23	70.4
	Carlisle Local	<b>95.9</b>	<b>99.4</b>	21	50
	Franklin City	<b>93.9</b>	<b>96.8</b>	20	50.7
	Kings Local	<b>96.1</b>	<b>106.7</b>	24	71.6
	Lebanon City	<b>97.2</b>	<b>103.1</b>	23	68.1
	Little Miami Local	<b>97.7</b>	<b>102.9</b>	22	73.3
	Mason City	<b>98.4</b>	<b>110.3</b>	25	81.6
	Springboro Community City	<b>97.1</b>	<b>106.5</b>	24	80.1
<b>Sig County Average</b>	Wayne Local	<b>98.4</b>	<b>106.4</b>	22	62.9
		<b>93.4</b>	<b>97.3</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>60.7</b>
<b>State Average</b>		<b>94.4</b>	<b>98.7</b>	<b>21.4</b>	<b>60.8</b>

### 2010-2011, cont.

<b>County</b>	<b>District Name</b>	<b>Mean SAT Score 2009-10</b>	<b>% Graduates Participating in SAT 2009-10</b>	<b>% Graduates Graduating with Honors Diploma 2009-10</b>	<b>Four-Year "On-Time" Graduation Rate 2009-10</b>
<b>Allen</b>	Lima City	0	0	11.6	61.8
	Delphos City	1340	1.2	24.4	90
	Bluffton Exempted Village	988	4.1	27.8	98
	Allen East Local	1060	1.4	19.2	89.6
	Bath Local	1284	2.4	8.7	86.7
	Elida Local	1128	4.5	21.9	87.6
	Perry Local	0	0	10.3	83.1
	Shawnee Local	1132	9.2	21.1	92
	Spencerville Local	0	0	17.8	97.3
<b>Butler</b>	Middletown City	924	4.7	17.8	72.6
	Edgewood City	1048	3.2	17.6	84.5
	Fairfield City	1070	19.9	20.7	90
	Lakota Local	1120	39.2	29.1	92.4

<b>Clark</b>	Madison Local	1022	7.8	32.2	84
	New Miami Local	1030	1.6	0	88.4
	Ross Local	1060	25.1	20.7	92.1
	Monroe Local	990	11.6	27.2	92.4
	Talawanda City	1142	13.4	24.3	89.6
	Springfield City	1044	4.7	10.2	66.2
	Greenon Local	1084	14.1	25.2	87.2
	Tecumseh Local	1028	8.7	19.4	84.6
	Northeastern Local	984	5	17.7	91.1
<b>Madison</b>	Northwestern Local	1026	4.6	15.1	95.5
	Southeastern Local	890	1.8	16.1	93.1
	Clark-Shawnee Local	1022	16.7	28	92.7
	London City	1044	21.2	10.6	91.4
<b>Marion</b>	Jefferson Local	1008	4	17.2	90.4
	Jonathan Alder Local	1172	3.6	31.7	95.7
	Madison-Plains Local	1152	4.4	20.4	90.6
	Marion City	1062	1.9	5.7	70.1
<b>Richland</b>	Elgin Local	0	0	16.8	85.2
	Pleasant Local	1140	4.2	27.4	84.8
	Ridgedale Local	1070	1.8	14	77.5
	River Valley Local	1120	4.2	0	81.2
<b>Scioto</b>	Mansfield City	966	3.4	12.6	63.1
	Shelby City	1410	0.6	31.7	87.5
	Clear Fork Valley Local	1040	2.9	19.9	88.7
	Crestview Local	1034	3.4	19.5	86.3
	Lexington Local	1222	11.2	30.2	91.6
	Lucas Local	0	0	16	92.5
	Madison Local	1200	1	16.3	83
	Plymouth-Shiloh Local	0	0	8.5	84.1
	Ontario Local	956	4.2	21.8	93.4
<b>Seneca</b>	Bloom-Vernon Local	960	1.3	14.7	93.8
	Clay Local	0	0	0	80.9
	Green Local	0	0	16.7	94.7
	Minford Local	990	2.2	7.6	91
	New Boston Local	948	27.8	61.1	--
	Northwest Local	1036	2.6	0	89.7
	Portsmouth City	0	0	5.9	82.5
	Valley Local	1370	1	24.7	95
	Washington-Nile Local	1080	1.9	10.3	83.1
	Wheelersburg Local	960	4.1	24.5	94.1
	Bettsville Local	750	6.3	12.5	--
	Fostoria City	1320	0.9	9.8	75.8

Tuscarawas	Hopewell-Loudon Local	910	4.8	25.4	95.5
	New Riegel Local	1058	11.8	29.4	100
	Old Fort Local	790	2.5	22.5	92.9
	Seneca East Local	1170	4.3	34.4	83
	Tiffin City	1080	4.2	11.6	89.5
	Garaway Local	1000	1.1	23.2	100
	Indian Valley Local	1170	1.6	7	90.7
	Newcomerstown Exempted Village	0	0	14.5	93.3
	New Philadelphia City	1082	4.9	19.1	85.4
Warren	Strasburg-Franklin Local	1166	4	24	86.2
	Tuscarawas Valley Local	1096	3.5	14.8	95.8
	Carlisle Local	1052	3.4	9.3	88.1
	Franklin City	1028	1.9	24.5	86.5
	Kings Local	1128	26.5	26.1	93.9
	Lebanon City	1102	13	24	92.2
	Little Miami Local	1108	9.7	28.4	95.5
	Mason City	1166	43.7	42	96.8
	Springboro Community City	1118	19.9	33.1	92.2
Sig County Average	Wayne Local	1256	3.2	32.3	95.2
		<b>901.3</b>	<b>5.6</b>	<b>18.4</b>	<b>87.6</b>
State Average		<b>936.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>88.8</b>

## References

Betts, Julian and Emily Tang. "The Effect of Charter Schools on Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Literature." National Charter School Research Project, University of Washington. 2011

Booker, Kevin et al. "Charter School Performance in Texas: Are Children Who Stay Behind Left Behind?" 2004. <http://web.utk.edu/~sgilpatr/charterperf.pdf>

C. Stoddard. "Why did Education Become Publicly Funded? Evidence from the Nineteenth-Century Growth of Public Primary Schooling in the United States," The Journal of Economic History 69 (1), (March 2009), pp. 172-201.

"Ohio Charter School Performance Report for 2010-2011"

Bialik, Carl. "Studies That Grade Charter Schools Rely on Imperfect Math" Wall Street Journal, November 2010.

Carnoy, Martin; Rebecca Jacobsen, Lawrence Mishel, and Richard Rothstein. "The Charter School Dust-Up: Examining the Evidence on Enrollment and Achievement." Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College Press. Washington, D.C., 2005. ISBN: 0-8077-4615-0

McCall, Ken and Laura A. Bischoff. "Suspect Test Scores Found Across Ohio Schools." Dayton Daily News, Dayton, OH. March 25, 2012.  
<http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/dayton-news/suspect-test-scores-found-across-ohio-schools-1349386.html>

NAEP Validity Studies Panel, 2006. *"Validity Study of the NAEP Mathematics Assessment: Grades 4 and 8"*.  
[http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?\\_nfpb=true&\\_ERICExtSearch\\_h\\_SearchValue\\_0=ED499213&ERICExtSearch\\_SearchType\\_0=no&accno=ED499213](http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_h_SearchValue_0=ED499213&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED499213)

Ohio Department of Education - Data panels and Reports. *Ohio Charter School Performance Report for 2010-2011*. Prepared by Public Impact.  
<http://www.ode.state.oh.us/GD/Templates/Pages/ODE/ODEPrimary.aspx?page=2&TopicRelationID=390>

Old Deluder Act - <http://www.constitution.org/primarysources/deluder.html>

Stancavage, Frances B. et al. An Agenda for NAEP Validity Research. NAEP Validity Studies (NVS) Panel, October 2002.

Teske, Paul and Mark Schneider. *"What Research Can Tell Policymakers about School Choice."* 2001 Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. Volume 20, Issue 4, pages 609–631, Autumn (Fall) 2001

Teske, Paul et al. *"Does Charter School Competition Improve Traditional Public Schools?"* Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, 2000. Civic Report No. 10.  
[http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr\\_10.htm](http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_10.htm)

*"No Child Left Behind: New Evidence that Charter Schools Help Even Kids in Other Schools"*. Wall Street Journal, 2009.  
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703574604574499592392782438.html>